NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXIV.

MAY, 1891.

THE GOSPEL FOR WEALTH.

BY THE RIGHT REV. HENRY C. POTTER, D. D., BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

THE interesting papers by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, bearing a title slightly different from that at the head of this communication, have, not unworthily, awakened a wide and keen interest. It is a hopeful sign when one who himself bears the repute of being a very rich man can approach a subject confessedly of so much importance, not alone with such cordial interest, but with such entire candor; and when, best of all, he can take such high ground, and define his own position in such unmistakable terms.

For it is a discouraging feature of the present situation that, apparently, it so little interests those who are supremely concerned with it. There are a great many of us who are not possessors of great wealth, nor ever likely to be, who are entirely ready to tell those who are how perilous a possession it is, and precisely what they should do with it. Indeed, the satirist might find tempting food for his humor if he could read the correspondence of rich men and know what increasing streams of counsel and admonition, as well as of solicitation, flow in upon them. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that irritation is followed by impatience, and impatience by resentment, and that, in turn, too often by stony indifference. Indeed, it is greatly to the honor of many people of great wealth that they do not become so indurated to the cries of criticism and of mendicancy as to dismiss the whole question of the stewardship of wealth as one impossible of solution.

Unfortunately, too many of them do, and the fact to which I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have just adverted is a most impressive, and in some aspects of it pathetic, evidence of that fact. The paper which I am discussing is, so far as my own observation goes, absolutely unique. At this moment I cannot recall, in our generation, any other instance of one possessed of exceptional wealth who has undertaken to discuss, publicly and at any length, the question of its disposition. And yet it would seem as if there were no other question which ought more profoundly to interest the rich. Great wealth is a great power. Leaving out of sight, for the time being, its possible effects upon its possessor, it is still, with reference to other people, a very dangerous power. Such proverbs as "Every man has his price" may be false—thank God they are! But they could not exist, and find such wide acceptance, if they had not in them a considerable element of truth. And when once that is admitted, it follows plainly that he who possesses, in some huge degree, the power of corrupting his fellow-men controls an extremely dangerous force. This is true, moreover, whether we regard every man as a purchasable creature, or whether we merely regard society as corruptible as a whole. For it does not need that men and women should be bought for some evil purpose by money in order to be corrupted by it. A much more subtile and more general form of corruption is that which reaches down from the vices and extravagancies of the rich to those who are below them in the scale of wealth. "Did you ever notice," said some one, "the faces of domestic servants in great houses—how sodden and sensual, how furtive and disingenuous, how vicious and unwholesome, they often become. What makes it so?" And the questioner answered his own inquiry by saying that "when one served all the while people who were steeped in luxury, 'busy in idleness,' as an old English dramatist wrote, and careless and prodigal in every selfish expenditure, it was impossible but that he should catch the disease himself"!

But the disease spreads wider than the kitchen and the servants' hall. Does anybody who lives in a great city go about at all in public places and public conveyances without noting the enormous increase in costliness of personal ornamentation which obtains among all classes? When the late Mr. Tweed was in the zenith of his power as "Boss" of New York, he was standing one day in the Mayor's office, talking with the person who then

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(as since then too often!) had been elected as the occupant of that office to do the work of a "ring," when a large diamond stud dropped upon the floor and rolled to the feet of a gentleman from whom I heard the incident. He picked it up—it was a diamond as big nearly as a good-sized strawberry—and offered it to the Mayor. Said "his Honor": "It is not mine." "Nor mine," said one after another of the circle, as it was passed around. "Stop a moment," said the "Boss," fumbling with his clothes. "Ah, yes; I believe it is one of my suspender buttons." But if bosses must have diamonds to do the rougher work of personal investiture, their henchmen must have something quite as fine for other and more conspicuous service. And as one sees women and men whose circumstances in life, honorably interpreted, can, it would seem, by no possibility explain the costly raiment and costlier jewelry with which they are bedizened, the mind is inevitably started upon a train of speculation which must needs have its issue in most dreary and tragic apprehensions. What is the saddest of them if it is not this—that somewhere there is somebody with the command, practically, of illimitable money, who may not at all use it actively to corrupt another, but the contagion of whose extravagance fires that baleful light of envy in another's eye which will not be quenched until it has, at whatever cost, touched the same extreme limit of tawdry and vulgar display?

Now, I do not see how anybody who has great wealth, and whose habit is one of large and loose expenditure, can dismiss that aspect of this subject without profound mental concern. It is a most painful consideration, or ought to be to any right-minded persons, that their heedless and selfish use of money is corrupting the very air which is breathed by their fellows; and the amiable sophistry that luxury and extravagance put money in circulation, and so promote a beneficent expenditure, becomes, in the face of our modern civilization, with its complex and tremendous social problems, simply a monstrous impertinence. Let me forestall any gratuitous sneer by the disciples of the "Manchester doctrine" of social science, by saying that I have not the smallest intention of advocating any system of promiscuous doles, or free soup-houses, or General Booth's "harbors," or any other future contribution to the greater degradation of the poor. But it ought not to be necessary to tell any rich man who honestly desires to be told,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how he can wisely employ money to promote art, to beautify men's homes, and naturally, and, if he chooses, preëminently, his own, and so do that which will make men's lives brighter and the guests under his roof or at his table more happy, without spending money in ways that are wanton in the prodigality of their profuseness and only wasteful in the essentially cheap and perishable character of their results.

I went the other day to the house of a gentleman in a great city (alas, he is not an American—nor an Englishman, let me add,—would that it were much the way of either!) where the guests were bidden to celebrate the opening of a beautiful and stately mansion. There was the most perfect administration of domestic service, there was an hour of the most exquisite music (to which, unhappily, most of the guests were apparently reluctant to listen), and then there was a cup of tea, and the simple, refined, and thoroughly refreshing occasion was at an end. It is difficult to see why such an entertainment may not be regarded in a profuse and overstimulated age, as a wholesome and charming object-lesson. Music, painting, sculpture, the multiplication of means for placing the advantages of artistic culture and recreation within the reach of those whose lives are bare and hard—surely these are avenues for the employment of wealth that stain no innocent soul, and leave no heartbreak behind them!

And that brings me to the one word which I want to contribute to this discussion, already in danger of being unduly prolonged.

I have entitled what is here said, "The Gospel for Wealth," as distinguished from the "Gospel of Wealth." The latter is concerned with wealth as a means of contributing to the happiness of those in whose behalf it is expended. But I have in mind what wealth may become to those who worthily employ it. The gospel—the God's spell—for the wealthy,—Can wealth be made efficient for the greater happiness of those who expend it, and if so, how? There are plenty of people who are entirely clear as to how that question can be answered; but it would hardly seem that very rich people have made the discovery. Froissart, in his Chronicles, writes of those "who take their pleasure sadly, after the manner of the English"; and when one goes into Central Park and looks at the people who, like Miss Bella Wilfer in "Our Mutual Friend," have learned how to "loll in their carriages,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it must be owned that they who "take their pleasure sadly" still survive in large numbers among ourselves. It is not alone that so many very rich people seem care-worn, and often anxious and abstracted. It is impossible that any one should have great and grave responsibilities without in some way showing their scars; and mediocrity, whether in gifts or in possessions, may well console itself in the consciousness that, if it is without either of these, it is, in the same measure at any rate, without great anxieties. But what I have in mind is that loss of enthusiasms, that contraction of the horizon of interests, that induration of the faculties that are touched by nature, by humanity, by nobleness of achievement, which, I think it must be owned, is a very frequent, if not a very common, characteristic of the possessors of great wealth.

I may not turn aside to explain such a fact, though I am persuaded that it is not difficult of explanation; but it will not be denied that if it be true it points to a loss out of life of that which is of priceless value. To keep the heart young; to have the powers that rouse us to keen interest, and sustain us in kindly and helpful service, vigorous and alert; to have the world and our fellow-men so rich in points of enkindling contact that, whatever may befall our capacities of achievement, our sympathies never grow old or cold—surely this is to have snatched from the hand of fate the secret of happiness, the glory of being!

And this is possible to rich people as to poor people, on precisely the same terms. One's own life must somehow reach over into, and be qualified by, the struggles and interests of other lives. In the case of the poor this is made inevitable by the hard conditions of their poverty. As in an open boat, with half-rations, all must learn self-restraint for the good of all, since individual selfishness means death to most, so it is in the sorrows, hardships, and struggles that come to the men and women who live on a day's wage. And so it comes to pass, no less, that these supremely venerate, because they better understand, all heroism, and kindle quickest at a brave and kindly deed. When, the other day, that brilliant soldier and kindly and knightly gentleman who was well described as "our best-beloved citizen," was borne to his rest, it was in the streets and avenues where the tenement-houses abound that the tributes of love and reverence for his memory were most conspicuous—even as in Fifth Avenue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they were least so. And the contrast was itself a parable wherein it needed no seer to discern how those whose hardships were bravely and patiently borne instinctively honored one whose splendid service was dimmed, from end to end, by no mean thought of self, and whose love and concern for his gallant "boys" was ever more eager and alert than any care for himself.

But it is the tendency of a well-clad, well-fed, comfortable, and sheltered life to make such care and concern for others more and more impossible, save as it resolutely seeks opportunities for its exercise. Unfortunately, at this point, a conspicuous tendency of our modern philanthropy interferes in a most discouraging way. That tendency, whether in the case of long-existing evils or of exceptional emergencies, is to deal with the problems which confront it vicariously. The first thought in the face of any great evil, injustice, or suffering would seem to be that it must be referred to a committee. The history of social reforms in our day is apt to be summed up in the story of a public meeting, with eloquent speeches, and the appointment of committees, and the raising of funds. Undoubtedly all these may have a useful place in any great and humane undertaking. But it is interesting to note that, in the history of the greatest reforms and of benevolent movements that have illustrated what may be called considerable "staying" power, their beginnings have been of quite a different kind. Some single mind has been stirred by an emergency, and without waiting for others has set about doing what it could itself. Some one man or woman, kindled into a flame of indignation by some imperious necessity, has hastened, without tarrying for company, to meet it; and, doing so, has, oftener than otherwise, shown how it may be met; and that example, proving, as example always is, contagious, has repeated itself in ever-widening circles.

More than a quarter of a century ago an English gentleman of fortune, culture, and honorable lineage, profoundly moved by the condition of the most neglected classes in London, determined, at any rate, to try to understand them better; and, that he might do so, went quietly and lived among them. It seemed a foolish and hopeless waste of fine powers and generous sympathies upon a hopeless and impossible task. But to-day Oxford House and Toynbee Hall and the People's Palace, and less-known centres of "sweetness and light" all over East and South London, show,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with inspiring significance, that Edward Dennison did not give himself to England's poor unwisely or in vain. Steadily has the spell of that solitary nobleness reached on, and reached out, until we are seeing it reproduced among ourselves, and that by men and women alike, in ways which, when one is tempted to despair of his kind, are at once a revelation and a rebuke.

In a recent discussion as to the methods of the Salvation Army and "General" Booth's scheme for the abolition, in England, of poverty, an individual testimony was called out as to the comparative value, in individual cases, of what may be called the individual method in reaching and succoring those who are generally considered as representing the most hopeless element in our vast problem of poverty and vice, which has in it a truth of profoundest import. Says the writer:

"Years ago I began to seek for a way to reach these lowest people. I went to 'organized charities,' public, private, religious, and secular, in the leading cities of America and Germany. I questioned individual workers of every and no religious creed, and in every case asked, and was allowed to see, the actual working of the methods employed. The result both startled and depressed me. The reformation of a nature arrived at maturity in ways of vice seemed something scarcely ever achieved. The matron of one of the best-known reformatory institutions in America told me that, in all the years she had held her office, *she had not known a single case of reform.* A cultivated and earnest woman, whose whole life is devoted to charitable work in connection with one of the largest churches in one of our first cities, told me she was afraid their poor converts came chiefly for the 'loaves and fishes.' Another woman, of equal intelligence and experience in the same work, said the same thing. An open-handed philanthropist, a man of high standing and marked ability among able men, said that now, towards the end of a long life, he could think of but one person in whom there had been reform in *conduct*, and that one man had really reformed himself!

"After much testimony of this nature, I began to wonder whether the people I wanted to help could not tell me more about themselves than any one else could know. I made up my mind that the next degraded-looking woman I met begging I would speak to as I should like any one who loved me to speak to me. I went into a part of the city where such women are met. Almost immediately I came on one, exchanging hideous repartees with a set of rough men. She turned to me and asked me to give her ten cents. As she look up at me her face, for a second, struck me dumb; it was more repulsive than any brute's. To see a woman look like that almost broke my heart. I could scarcely speak; but with an effort I said simply, 'Come with me,' and she came. I questioned her. I told her I could not bear to have a woman like that, and if she would trust me with the real truth of her life, I knew we could make her life worth living, which it certainly was not now. To this she assented, with answering directness. She told me she was 'all bad'; had been sent to prison again and again; loved drink, and when drunk 'would do anything'; was about forty years old now, and, when out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of prison, had been in most of the reformatory institutions in the city. Nothing had ever done her any good; she did not think she was 'that kind.' I had better let her go. By this time we were before the door of a religious institution to which I had made up my mind to bring her, but, as I turned to speak to her, her face overcame me again, and to my own consternation I burst into tears, and wept over her convulsively. She wavered for a second, and then with a cry of 'O, *dear*, my *dear*, don't cry like that, *don't, don't!* I will *try*, indeed I will!' she grasped my hand, and suddenly burst into a storm of tears herself. We astonished the dignified matron of the house which we entered, who told me, *before the wretched woman*, that she knew her to be a hopeless case, and nothing but prison bars would restrain her. I told her that I did not believe Christ would say so, and I took my poor sister to another institution. They refused her, on the same ground as the first. We went to another, with the same result. The woman was Irish, uneducated, and, by courtesy, a Roman Catholic. But the Catholic Reformatory Institution, too, said that a prison was the only place for her.

"By this time she and I had walked far on a cold winter day, and were very cold and tired. I was boarding, and had no home of my own to which I could take her. I told her so, but also said that I could not give her up, and if she would come with me to my boarding-house for rest and luncheon I would try to think of what could be done afterwards. She came, to the horror of my eminently respectable Christian landlady, and after an hour we set out again, but with no better result. My heart grew sick and hot within me, and at last the poor rejected creature rushed off from the last place where they refused to have her, calling out: 'You see, it's *no use, no use!*' But I called after her, 'Yes, it is; remember my street and number!' I supposed I had lost her, in spite of myself. The weeks went by, and I saw nothing of her, and I did not know where to look for her. At last, three months afterwards, she appeared at my boarding-house, asked to see me, but, by the orders of the Christian landlady, was refused admittance. She then asked the servant, who happened to be the same one who had admitted her on the first occasion, to tell me that from the day she left me she had not touched a drop of liquor and had been what I wanted her to be. The servant added: 'And the truth it was, too, for she looked so different and so decent I scarcely knew her.'

"Now, here was a case where not one penny had been expended; indeed, the woman was told with simple frankness that I believed the worst thing I could do would be to give her money; but, on the other hand, I neither howled, nor grinned, nor used her language. I spoke straight from my inmost soul the deepest, the sweetest truth I knew, and 'Deep answered unto deep.' In the presence of such need I learned the clearest lesson of my life, 'For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that ye should love one another.'"

Such a testimony is certainly not to be disesteemed, and its suggestive value cannot easily be overestimated. And for my purpose now it is preëminently of value as indicating, not alone the power of individual effort and sympathy, but the rewards of it. To know that one has been privileged to be the means, if not of en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tirely reclaiming, at least of reawakening some lost life to courage, and self-control, and hope and faith in God and in its fellows—this certainly is to win the deepest joy and the highest happiness of which a human heart is capable.

And to this happiness, in the case of those who possess wealth and leisure, there open many avenues. Not alone in the case of the most alienated and least cared for, but in its ministry to youth, to inexperience, to the tempted and wronged, there are opportunities for the personal activities of individual gifts and acquirements, the improvement of which in the case of any one of generous and noble instincts—and what man or woman is wholly without these?—will be sure to issue in ever-increasing delight. A few years ago a citizen of New York, alone and unaided, set out to found a trade school for American boys and young men. He encountered ignorant prejudice, he awakened hostile criticism, he provoked organized opposition; but he persevered, and to-day the result of his large expenditure of time and money, and sympathy, has issued in a foundation which gathers within its walls hundreds of youths from all parts of the United States, which has dignified and ennobled every handicraft which it aims to teach, which has vindicated the right of every young man to the best training in skilled labor, and which, perhaps best of all, has illustrated the power of a single fraternal and unselfish purpose, modestly but resolutely pursued, to achieve the highest results, and in doing so to illustrate the sure rewards that await a noble and unwearied endeavor.

The opportunities for such endeavor are, I repeat, almost innumerable. When Mayor of New York, the Hon. Abram S. Hewitt was led to investigate the operations of the local police courts. That in these and on the bench there are honest and well-meaning men, I do not at all doubt. But that the interests of justice are best served by a system in which the fate of almost every prisoner is practically determined by the testimony of the policeman who is complainant and the judge whose knowledge of law and whose instinct of equity may easily be equally imperfect, is (to state the case with the utmost reserve) extremely improbable. That, as a matter of fact, such an administration of the forms of law issues frequently in the gravest injustice, to those, especially, who are most obscure, who have no "pull" on the court, who can invoke no neighboring rum-seller, or other local politician,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to whisper an aside into the ear of the sitting magistrate—this is a certainty which it requires considerable boldness to challenge.

What an opportunity here for the personal intervention of those whose means and position make them strong enough to insist that it shall be listened to! What a fine school for a young student or unemployed practitioner of the law! What an inviting field for any one, man or woman, who can plead another's cause or help to right another's wrongs! The Church Club, in the Diocese of New York, contemplates the organization of a lawyers' guild for this and kindred purposes. It would afford a rare field in which learning and wealth might study and strive together.

For this I believe to be the true gospel *for* wealth, in whatever that wealth may consist. The world waits for new illustrations of that divinest beneficence which the great Apostle commemorates when, out of a full heart, broken and conquered by a resistless spell, he writes, "the Son of God who loved me, and gave *himself* for me!" This is the one secret of healing the world's sorrows and redeeming the world's lost ones; and, because it is, theirs will forever be the sweetest and most lasting satisfactions who, being rich in whatever men count wealth, themselves administer their wealth, so giving *themselves* for all the sad and sorrowful brotherhood of man!

HENRY C. POTTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IRRESPONSIBLE WEALTH.

BY THE HON. EDWARD J. PHELPS.

IT IS not quite easy to see why money which is not invested in real estate, or in other visible forms, should have recently come to be called "irresponsible wealth." If that phrase is to be understood as referring to the owners, it has no significance, unless the property in question is supposed to be secret, so that its possessors live and move in a community which does not know that they are rich. This is so difficult as to be almost impossible. While it is true that investments in securities, and especially in negotiable securities that pass readily from hand to hand without necessarily disclosing what hands, are more withdrawn than realty can be from the public eye, and can more readily escape taxation, a man cannot hold a large amount of them without the world becoming well aware of it. Unless he is very secretive, much away from the sight of men, and not incapable of a timely deception, he will hardly find it easy to have a great estate, and yet to conceal it from the inquisitive eyes of his neighbors. Least of all in a country where there is no secret which is not regarded as the lawful property of the public, for whose benefit thousands of detectives are constantly at work. Every man in America lives in a glass house, whether he throws stones at other people or not. Millionaires are usually well known, as the billionaires to come soon will be. Very few of them are "born to blush unseen," and there are perhaps those among them who are not much accustomed to blush at all.

But if great wealth is enjoyed by comparatively few, the cheaper luxury of advising them what to do with it is within the reach of us all. On no subject does it seem so easy for those who are not rich to advise as on that of charity. The generosity of mankind in the disposition of other people's money is creditable to human nature. It seems such an easy thing to give, and so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noble to do good and to relieve distress. Those who have little to spare, and who compare their own narrow incomes with great ones, quite naturally come to believe that the rich are but scanty in their benefactions, and to fancy that, if they were themselves wealthy, they would scatter their thousands with a grand benevolence, and always in the right direction. Where property is not visible, its amount is generally exaggerated in the public estimation, as partially-concealed forces are apt to be. Its proprietor has credit usually for more millions than he possesses, though doubtless in rare instances for less. The spectators overestimate his resources, and very much underestimate the increased demands of all sorts which follow the growth of wealth with a constant footstep. And they are often not at all aware, in the case of many rich men, of the amount that is really given away, or better than given away, through a thousand channels, quietly and without display.

Especially do those who criticise the charities of others fail to remember, or perhaps to know, how extremely difficult it is to give away money wisely and usefully. This suggestion may probably be controverted. We all have our favorite objects, each one of which appears to some of us the very best among the multitude of enterprises set on foot for the good of mankind. We see and are ready to admit that many of the projects that other people advocate, are mistaken, unworthy, ill-managed, and likely to be unfruitful. We perceive clearly enough that a good share of them are put in motion rather for the support of their agents and runners than for the attainment of the objects they propose to seek. But that is never the character of our own schemes, nor the purpose of the worthy persons who are carrying them on. Give liberally to the churches, cries one (meaning, of course, those of his own creed), for what can be so important to man as his eternal welfare? Give rather to the colleges, the schools, and the libraries, says another, for the very safety of the republic is in the education of its people. Relieve first of all, interposes a third, the suffering poor, and support the hospitals and asylums established for their benefit. Build monuments, shouts the fourth, to the illustrious dead, that shall be a perpetual stimulus to heroic exertion, and durable emblems of a nation's gratitude. And among the numberless institutions and proposals that within the lines of each of these important forms of beneficence, vie and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clash with each other in ceaseless and discordant appeal, we all have our particular favorites, on which, as it seems to us, whatever may be said about other schemes, too much money could hardly be lavished by the wealthy. Every one has within his own observation, also, many cases of individual and meritorious necessity, which it would be so gratifying to provide for, and which would so well repay liberality in the consciousness of doing good.

There can be no question of the importance and usefulness of all these principal objects. Some of their numerous agencies are conspicuous before the world, admirable in their work, their management, and their success. Others, less widely known, might be found upon investigation to be equally worthy of support. Of private appeals to the benevolent, it goes without saying that very many are well founded. Still the fact remains that, aside from a few institutions of unquestionable character, it is extremely difficult to select judiciously among the increasing multitude of demands. Their united clamor affects very differently those to whom it is addressed and those who help to make it; as the volume of sound from a large orchestra is one thing to the listener, and quite another to the individual performer, intent upon his own instrument, impressed with its importance, and giving little heed to any other. To discriminate among institutions and organizations, and to investigate properly private cases, requires an expenditure of time and labor that few men are able to bestow. Attempts at the relief of the poor, especially, are attended with great embarrassment. The term "the poor" is very comprehensive, very uncertain, and to unreflecting minds very satisfactory. But the questions, who are the deserving poor, how are they to be discovered and reached, and wisely as well as humanely relieved, have been found, by those who have undertaken the business, not easy to answer.

There is, of course, a class of helpless, born so, or overcome by misfortunes beyond their control. They are always and necessarily the proper objects of charity. But the great mass of the destitute in this country are brought to that condition by vice, idleness, and crime. They will not work in any resolute way, nor learn how to work to advantage, though to beg they are never ashamed. Their miserable earnings, so far as they have any, and whatever else they can lay hands on, are largely consumed in the saloons, and go to the support of the political potentates of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

municipalities. Their principal usefulness is in the breeding of paupers and criminals, and in holding the balance of power in popular elections. Their necessities may well enough be left to the public charity, supported by taxation, the burden of which is steadily increasing. When those who are thus poor by their own fault are deducted from the general mass that we call the poor, the number that remains is comparatively small. And often those most needy and most worthy, deterred by self-respect from seeking alms, and struggling in vain to support themselves, are the last to be discovered and to profit by the benefactions of the charitable. Occasionally such an instance transpires through the newspapers, and always attracts relief, but only when it reaches extremity.

After the Piccadilly riots in London, three or four years ago, the suggestion was made in the public prints that want might be the real cause of the outbreak. The immediate response was the establishment of a fund in the hands of the Lord Mayor, to which very large sums were contributed by the wealthy, with reckless generosity. The existence of this provision at once attracted to London crowds of professional paupers and sharpers from all directions. And though every effort was made by the committee in charge to dispense the money judiciously, it afterwards came to be known that a large share of it found its way into unworthy hands, and was a positive mischief instead of a relief, the subject of plunder rather than the means of charity.

These remarks are not intended to discourage the relief of the poor, enough of whom meritorious as well as needy are always with us, but only to suggest how much easier it is to cry without reflection, "Give to the poor," than it is to give discreetly and usefully when the matter is taken in hand. There are excellent organizations for the purpose, no doubt, to which contributions may be well intrusted. But even here, as there are poor and poor, so there are societies and societies. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* is a question that will never cease to be material in the dispensation of beneficence of any sort. Every day's observation shows how much money is given away, in many directions and for many purposes, with the best of motives but with the worst of judgment, and the most inadequate and even mischievous results.

The discussion of this subject, commenced by Mr. Carnegie,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and continued in the magazines on both sides of the Atlantic, has drawn out some very eminent men, Cardinal Manning and Mr. Gladstone among the number. The proposition with which Mr. Carnegie sets out, that it is better for a rich man to dispense his charities in his lifetime than to leave them to be administered under his will, is undeniable. Coming from one who is not merely admonishing a class to which he does not belong concerning duties that are not his own, but who by generous example illustrates what by precept he enjoins, his suggestions deserve and will receive attention. The facilities afforded in many places, in the administration of what is called justice, for the prolonged contest of wills upon no just grounds whatever, to the waste of estates, the slander of the dead, and often the distress of surviving relatives, until an unrighteous compromise is finally extorted, are a constant warning to those who have wealth to dispose of, to do it while they still live, and can assert control over their own. It is only in theory that a man has a right to make his own will, if he has much to leave behind him. And the difficulties which under the most favorable circumstances attend the administration of considerable post-mortuary charities, tend strongly to support Mr. Carnegie's views.

Mr. Gladstone's proposal, set forth in an interesting article, for bringing to pass what he appears to think is needed—a larger measure of giving on the part of the rich—does not seem likely to be acceptable to those whom it addresses. His suggestion is that rich men should enter into a sort of compact with each other to give away annually a certain proportion of their respective incomes. Even if it is necessary to devise schemes to stimulate the generosity of the wealthy, this one will hardly commend itself as practicable. It is not reasonable to suppose that any considerable number of men of large income would enter into such a society, binding themselves, by an honorary engagement even stronger in its obligation than a legal contract, to relinquish a material share of their revenue annually, whether satisfactory opportunities or really worthy objects present themselves or not. It would be surrendering not only their property, but the freedom of volition which men do not like to part with, and which gives charity all its merit. Were such an obligation assumed, the life of the parties to it would speedily become a burden. It would be impossible to receive or answer, much less to investigate and con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sider, the thousands of applications of every conceivable description that would pour in from all quarters, many of them dishonest, many more unwise or impracticable; and even those that are both honest and expedient, only to be found so through careful examination, and then to be discriminated from a multitude of others, equally meritorious and equally importunate. Whoever was induced to enlist into such an army of benevolence, would soon be compelled either to obtain his discharge or to desert and fly.

The duty of charity, incumbent upon all according to their ability, and increasing in its demands as the means for meeting them are enlarged, will be universally conceded. It may well be inculcated, as all other duties are, by preaching, and still better by example. The world has not outgrown the necessity for either. However difficult it may be to discriminate, good opportunities will always present themselves to him who is willing to attend to them. But it must be conceded, after all, that, more perhaps than any other in the world, this duty and the selection of its objects must be left to the conscience and the judgment of the individual. Every man should be allowed to judge for himself in respect to it, without undue importunity beforehand or unfair criticism afterwards. If property has any rights, one of the most obvious is that its owner shall be the exclusive judge of how much, when, how, and where he shall give away. Whatever he does, if he is able to give largely, he will disappoint many. However careful, he will sometimes go wrong. He will give where he ought to refuse; he will refuse where he ought to give; he will give in one way when it would be better to give in another. If he gives often to individuals, he will make many an enemy among those who accept his bounty. It is only the better class of minds that are capable of gratitude, or can endure the sense of obligation, though quite willing to be under obligation. The other sort, while prompt to accept assistance, will always find excuse for denying to the giver either thanks or acknowledgment.

One of the very best methods of charity open to a man of liberal means is to spend his income. But this way of doing good with money is not appreciated as it should be. The paupers and the destitute are by no means the only class who need help. The great mass of those who earn their own living in some form or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other of honest industry or business, whose self-respect rejects under any circumstances the idea of accepting charity, far more of asking for it, are the most deserving and much the most numerous class; and they cannot exist without the employment and patronage which come from those who are able to pay. There is no charity so wholesome as helping those who help themselves. Instead of pauperizing and humiliating its recipients, it elevates them in their own esteem and in that of those among whom they live. Instead of teaching them to lean upon others, it enables them to take care of themselves honorably and manfully, and to "look the whole world in the face." There are thousands who are apparently in no need of assistance, and who hide their troubles from the public eye, who do not find it easy to make the two ends of the year meet, who have always to practise much self-denial, and even to undergo privation when embarrassed by hard times, illness, or misfortune. There is a keeping-up of appearances which is praiseworthy and pathetic, as well as one that is pretentious and ridiculous. There are those too, and they are many, who are beginning the world. If there is anywhere a just object of sympathy, it is the young person starting out, slender in capital, but strong in hope, to make an honest living, and to find a worthy and respected path in life. These are they who are reached and blessed, not by institutions nor by benefactions lauded among men, but by the increase and encouragement of the flow of trade and business out of which they live, which, like the stream on its way to the sea, slakes the thirst and refreshes the weariness of thousands. And they can be reached and helped in no other way.

The man who dispenses his money freely in the channels of employment is often doing more good with it and less harm, whether he knows it or not, than if he were giving it away. The very pleasures and luxuries of the rich, for which they are so commonly criticised, minister necessarily to the livelihood of a multitude of deserving and hard-working people. The country house, the yacht, the opera-box, the club, the elegance of furniture, of costume, of equipage and adornment, all the various incidents of fastidious taste, are superfluities, no doubt. A man can do without them, as most men must. But to what an army do they give bread! The idea that they had better be relinquished, and the cost taken from the workers and given to those who do not work, is a false one. The precious ointment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the woman was reproached for lavishing needlessly on the object of her adoration, because it might have been sold for much and given to the poor, was not on that account rejected ; perhaps because it was remembered that its price had been already bestowed upon the not undeserving poor whose industries had combined to produce it.

But if what Mr. Carnegie calls "the Gospel of Wealth" is to be preached, or what others term the responsibilities of wealth are to be measured, we should begin with its obligations rather than with its beneficence. While it may freely be conceded to the rich that they should be their own judges of the amount and direction of their charities, there are demands upon them which society has a right to enforce, and ought to insist upon. If there are no duties to be discharged, there are offences to be avoided which are possible to no other class. We cannot compel them to be generous, and we have no warrant to attempt it ; but we are entitled to require that they should be just. Selfishness is a vice, but rapacity is a crime. To them applies with extreme force the ancient maxim of the common law—*sic utere tuo, ut non alienum laedas.* They are bound, first and above all, to refrain from such a use of the vast power of wealth as results either in the plunder of less fortunate men or the demoralization of society at large. Estates already great enough are being made to accumulate with accelerating rapidity by methods which involve both these offences, and are becoming oppressive in the last degree.

Great combinations of capital are organized to enhance unreasonably the price of various necessaries of life, and to extinguish that fair competition in their production which is the safeguard against monopoly and extortion. A burdensome tax is thus laid upon all who have their living to earn, in order to swell unduly the profits of concerns already plethoric with wealth. And when courts of justice interfere against these conspiracies and declare them illegal, fresh devices are resorted to in order to evade the law and to continue the plunder of the public.

In the financial centres, also, there are going on, all the while, fraudulent schemes which impoverish those whose small investments are the fruit of their industry and the provision for their families, to the enrichment of men who through large wealth are able to control transactions. The surplus that in ordinary employments is slowly accumulated, rarely large enough to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2.30

called wealth, must be invested somewhere and somehow, in order to produce any return. Its disposition is anxiously and carefully made, in thousands of instances, in apparently trustworthy securities, and upon such light as can be obtained, in the hope that from 4 to 6 per cent. per annum may fairly be realized with safety to the principal. But the control of the corporation to which these securities belong is acquired by great operators, often through adroit manipulation, not with a view to the honest discharge of the fiduciary relation thus assumed, nor for the protection of the property of others thus intrusted to their charge, but for the purpose of enriching themselves at the expense of their trust. Gradually, by one scheme and another, and by various expedients of management and mismanagement, the property of the corporation is absorbed or turned into indebtedness. The stockholders are plundered, while the wealth of the managers rises into the millions. This is no fancy picture or casual instance. It is a regular course of business, of which the examples are not far to seek. It is true that many corporations are most uprightly and honorably conducted. Malversation is the exception, not the rule. But the exceptions are so numerous as to have become a great and flagrant evil.

These methods of what is called business prey upon individuals. There is a much greater iniquity of wealth which attacks the general public, and even threatens the national life. It is the employment of vast sums of money for the purchase of high places of political trust and the control of the results of important elections. Places that should be of the highest dignity, as they certainly are of the largest influence, are pretty well known to be obtained by direct bribery of the electors in whose gift they are. Posts of much distinction are more than suspected to be the consideration of enormous contributions to electioneering funds. Great sums are generally believed to be raised to carry elections by those who are accumulating excessive fortunes through a system of revenue which not only casts the burden of taxation upon the industry of the country, instead of its property, but, far beyond the legitimate requirements of government, burdens the many for the benefit of the few. And these sums, which could not possibly be requisite for any proper election expenses, are well understood to be employed in the direct purchase of votes in the market, to a decisive extent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The political power of the country is thus in danger of passing into the hands of a plutocracy, composed not of the best class of the rich, but of the worst, to be used not for the general welfare, but for the still further aggrandizement of those who have bought it, and for the elevation to high places of men who are not fit to be there. These are plain words. But it is time plain words began to be spoken on this subject. Here is not the place to pursue it. Thoughtful men can consider it for themselves, and can satisfy themselves how far the general understanding is supported by the facts. They who believe that the business of government can be thus demoralized, and the general mass thus oppressed, with fortunate and peaceful results, have read the history of mankind to small purpose. The longer the storm broods before it breaks, the more dangerous it becomes. Already clouds much larger than a man's hand have risen above the horizon. How portentous they may prove no man can tell. Forces move rapidly in these days. There is nothing in government or institutions under our system that is not within the ultimate reach of the numerical majority. We are in danger, not of revolution or bloodshed, but of the not less destructive power of frantic and ruinous legislation, controlled by demagogues, and involving in its consequences the just as well as the unjust.

These are the abuses and the mischiefs of wealth, not its necessary results. If from them we can be protected, we need have little concern about its charities. It is certainly not a just ground of reproach against the rich men of this nation, as a body, that they have been niggardly either in benevolence or in public spirit. We have only to look about us to see ample proof to the contrary. What country is so abundant in the institutions of religion, of education, of all known forms of human charity? Where else are to be seen so many and, on the whole, such excellent examples of wise and thoughtful beneficence? Their visible monuments adorn almost every town. Nearly all are the offspring of private liberality. And though much has been contributed by those who have to earn their living, the munificence of the rich is everywhere conspicuous. It is but fair that this should be remembered, and that the prevalent idea that the wealthy are wanting in generosity should be reconsidered. There is a charity of thought and speech that is due to them, as well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a charity of benevolence that is due from them. One is quite as apt to be neglected as the other. We often hear of those who are said to be poor but honest. It is but just to bear in mind that there are many who are rich but honest, and generous to boot. In that class of society, as in all others, there are men of widely different character. There are those for whom mankind is no better; who use money only to make more money, and would carry it all with them when they die, if they could. They are "the cankers of a calm world." It is for their sins that their whole order is reproached. But we know that there are and have been many Americans whose large estates, honorably inherited or honestly acquired, are like springs in a dry land, freely flowing for the general relief; whose public benefactions are judicious, liberal, and often princely, and whose private charities are as generous as they are unostentatious. The race is not yet extinct in this country of those who "do good by stealth and blush to find it fame."

The idea that prevails in some quarters that large fortunes are in themselves detrimental or opposed to sound public policy is a mistake. So far from being dangerous or justly obnoxious, great estates in good hands are a most important advantage to the community. The world at this day could hardly do without them. If there was no such class, much of the grandest work of our time must come to a halt. The springs of charity would in a large measure dry up. The livelihood of many thousands of workers would fail. The burdens of life would fall heavily on the poor. All that society has a right to demand of the opulent (whatever it may ask) is that they should universally remember what so many of them illustrate in their lives, and yet so many forget—that if riches tend to ennoble, they likewise oblige. There are ways enough to use and enjoy wealth wisely, beneficially, at least harmlessly, as it must be used in the long run if it is to be tolerated, not to say protected. The choice among them belongs to the individual. But there are ways in which it leads to destruction, and devours its own offspring—ways of oppression, of extortion, of corruption. It is upon these that public opinion and public law ought to set their foot, not mildly, but decisively.

E. J. PHELPS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FAVORABLE ASPECTS OF STATE SOCIALISM.

BY THE RIGHT HON. J. CHAMBERLAIN, M. P.

THE advance of democracy during recent years in all popularly-governed countries has brought what is called the social question into great prominence. The greatest happiness of the greatest number, which was formerly only the benevolent aspiration of a philosopher, has become a matter of urgent practical politics.

Under the general name of socialism, the redistribution of wealth, the relations between labor and capital, and the extension of the functions of the state in regard to the industrial and domestic life of the people, have assumed a real and pressing importance.

New theories have been developed, and their practical application is already becoming a dividing-line between political parties. Exaggerated fears have been excited, and not less exaggerated hopes. On the one hand, timorous people have conjured up a vision of a desperate proletariat combined for the purpose of extorting from wealth a compulsory division of property, with the result that capital will leave its present investments, industry will be disorganized, trade diverted to other channels, and general insecurity will prevail, to be followed in due course by national disaster and ruin. On the other hand are to be found enthusiasts who indulge the hope that the legislation of the future, banishing to Saturn all the laws of political economy, will be able, as by a magician's wand, to exorcise the evils of our political system, and to redress the inequalities which individual character and circumstances, more often than the action of the state, have created in the lives of men.

These antagonistic views are supported by very different estimates of the present position of the masses of the people. The opponents of further state intervention point with confidence to the present position of the working classes as a satisfactory result of the sturdy maintenance of individual liberty and of the absence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of grandmotherly restriction and control. They assert that by the practice of reasonable industry and self-denial the ordinary workman may live and enjoy his life. He may find opportunities for recreation and intellectual improvement, and may hope to rise in the social scale, and to leave his children with prospects better even than his own. According to these optimists, this is the best of all possible worlds, in which only the knaves and the fools fail to secure some of its numerous prizes.

The socialists, on the contrary, see in the condition of the wage-earners the evidence of the terrible struggle for life in which the weakest go to the wall and only a few exceptional natures can survive and prosper. They allege that the great modern developments in science and invention have only benefited a handful of favored individuals, while the vast majority have gained nothing, and have even suffered by comparison; their misery seeming more profound in the shadow of the enormous prosperity of the successful minority. According to this view, the rich have grown richer and the poor poorer, so that the gulf between classes is wider than it ever was before.

If either of these views is accepted as absolute and complete, the logical conclusion would appear to be the same; and the statesman would be justified in both cases, although for different reasons, in abandoning the hope of improvement by ordinary legislative means. In the first case, the argument would be to let well alone, and not to disturb arangements which had produced so thoroughly satisfactory a result. In the second case, the proof that all the legislation of the last generation, much of it socialistic in its character, had failed to make any impression on the general mass of misery and discontent would justify the refusal to proceed further along lines which had led to no beneficial result.

It will, therefore, be a matter of interest to ascertain at the outset the true facts of the case, and to see whether the information at our disposal enables us to decide with confidence whether or no the condition of the people at large has improved during the last fifty years. Such a comparison is the more necessary because the present generation is always too apt to concentrate its attention on the times in which it is living, and, while appreciating keenly its own difficulties and distress, to forget the greater evils of the past, and thus to ignore the methods of im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provement which have been tested by experience, and which may therefore be safely continued in the future.

I took occasion, at a recent jubilee of the greatest and oldest of the friendly societies of Birmingham, to make such a contrast, drawn from the history of our town as well as from the general history of the country; and, although the picture is necessarily imperfect, it is suggestive both of the character and extent of the changes which have been already effected, and also of the legislation which has been chiefly instrumental in bringing them about.

Fifty years ago Birmingham was a town of 180,000 inhabitants, or about 40 per cent. of the present population. The ratable value was between £500,000 and £600,000, or rather less than one-third of what it is at present. There were at that time hardly any public edifices of any magnitude or importance. There were no parks, there were no free libraries, there were no baths, there was no art gallery or museum, there were no board schools, there was no school of art, and no technical institute or college. The era of street improvement had hardly begun. A large area in the centre of the town, which is now traversed by magnificent streets and occupied by some of the finest shops and warehouses, was one of the worst districts in the city, both from a social and a sanitary point of view. The streets themselves were badly paved, imperfectly lighted, and only partially drained. The foot-walks were worse than the streets. The gas and the water belonged to private monopolies. Gas, which is now sold at an average of two shillings and fourpence, cost then about five shillings per thousand cubic feet. Water was supplied by the company on three days in the week; on the other days those of the inhabitants who had no wells were obliged to purchase this necessary of life from carts which perambulated the town and supplied water from polluted sources at ten shillings the thousand gallons. It is not surprising that under these circumstances the annual mortality reached thirty in the thousand; now it is twenty in the thousand, and sometimes less. The only wonder is that it was not much greater, for there were whole streets from which typhus and scarlet fever, diphtheria, and diarrhœa in its worst forms were never absent. There were thousands of close, unventilated courts which were not paved, which were not drained, which were covered with pools of stagnant filth, and in which the ashpits and middens were in a state of indescribable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nastiness. The sewage of the town was so partial that it only extended over about one-third of the area. In fact, to sum up this description, it may truly be said that fifty years ago Birmingham, although it was no worse than any other of the great cities in the United Kingdom, was a town in which scarcely anything had been done either for the instruction, for the health, for the recreation, for the comfort, or for the convenience of the artisan population.

Now, let us measure the change which has taken place in these conditions within the memory of living men, and we shall see that nothing less than a revolution has been peacefully accomplished. It is hardly too much to say that the Birmingham of to-day is everything that old Birmingham was not. The sewerage has been completed, a system of sanitary inspection is strictly carried out, the private monopolies have been acquired by the corporation, their supply has been improved and cheapened, and the surplus profits have been carried to the credit of the rates. The town is well paved with wood in the principal streets, and with stone where there is the heaviest traffic. The footpaths have everywhere been put in order. The courts have been paved and drained. An infectious-hospital has been established, to which all contagious diseases are at once removed. In every district of the city there have been provided baths and wash-houses, parks and recreation-grounds, and free libraries which count their readers by hundreds of thousands. A magnificent art gallery and museum has been erected, the visitors to which number nearly a million in a single year. Schoolhouses, under the management of the School Board, with large playgrounds attached, have sprung up everywhere, and now accommodate 40,000 children, the rest being provided for in the voluntary schools. Technical education is offered at the Midland Institute and the Mason College, and art education at the School of Art and its branches. The great local endowed school of King Edward's foundation has been reformed and placed under representative management, and by means of scholarships offers the opportunity of higher education to the poorest of our citizens. In fact, the ordinary artisan finds now within his reach the appliances of health, the means of refinement, and the opportunities of innocent recreation which formerly were at the disposal of only the more wealthy inhabitants.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This striking improvement has been brought about by the operation of what may be called municipal socialism. It is the result of a wise coöperation by which the community as a whole, working through its representatives for the benefit of all its members, and recognizing the solidarity of interest which makes the welfare of the poorest a matter of importance to the richest, has faced its obligations and done much to lessen the sum of human misery, and to make the lives of all its citizens somewhat better, somewhat nobler, and somewhat happier.

Popular representative local government is the powerful instrument by which these reforms have been effected. Unlike the imperial legislation, it is very near to the poor, and can deal with details and with special conditions. It is subject to the criticism and direct control both of those who find the money and of those who are chiefly interested in its expenditure. In Great Britain, at any rate, it has been free from the suspicion of personal corruption, and it has always been able to secure the services of some of the ablest and most disinterested members of the community, who have been ready in this way to do the duty that lies nearest to them, and to do it with all their might.

It may, however, be supposed that this great work has been attended with enormous cost, and that property has been taxed unduly to provide for the wants and pleasures of those who contribute little or nothing to the necessary expenditure. There is no ground for such an opinion. The rates of Birmingham (if the charge due to the school rate and required to provide for a new service in the shape of elementary education be deducted) are less than they were thirty years ago, and the growth of the town and the increase in its wealth and ratable value have sufficed to meet these new developments of municipal functions. The present cost of all local work in the city, including poor-relief, education, and all the corporation expenditure, is about six shillings and sixpence in the pound on the assessed annual value of real property, which is probably 25 per cent. less than the actual value. Putting it in another way, the total charge is rather more than twenty shillings per head of the population, or about one-fifth of the charge of local administration in the city of Boston. Complaints of the burden of the rates are still heard from time to time, but they are less frequent and less forcible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than in the past. It is more and more coming to be recognized that the expenditure is in the nature of an investment, and that dividends are to be found in the improved health and comfort and the increased contentment of the people.

An interesting evidence of popular appreciation was afforded some years ago when the corporation promoted a bill consolidating their acts and in many cases extending their powers. Among other provisions was one repealing the general law which limits expenditure on art and education to a rate of one penny in the pound, and substituting unlimited powers of taxation for the purpose. The bill was opposed, and a poll of the ratepayers was demanded. The promoters boldly admitted their intention to spend more money in this direction, and made it their chief claim to support; and the ratepayers of Birmingham came in great numbers to the poll and by a large majority approved the bill, which has since been passed into law.

We must now turn from the special case of Birmingham to a more general survey of the comparative state of the whole kingdom. In reading histories which deal with the first half of the century, and especially those which refer to the period between 1830—before the first Reform Bill—and 1846, when the Corn Laws were repealed, one thing particularly strikes the observer, and that is the constant allusion to the turbulence of the times. Riots seem to have been of almost daily occurrence, and they were accompanied by long periods of exceptional distress. In the manufacturing districts there were serious disturbances, and it is significant both of the ignorance of the people and also of their destitution that these disturbances were generally attended by the destruction of machinery and the plunder of bakers' shops. In the agricultural districts the state of affairs was, if possible, still worse. There was not actual riot, but there were frequent outrages which took the form of incendiarism, so that on many occasions and during considerable periods the country districts were lighted up at night by burning ricks and flaming barns. The shopkeepers, especially the small shopkeepers who supplied the poor, were almost ruined by excessive taxation and by bad debts. The workingmen in the towns toiled for long hours and for an insufficient subsistence. In the country the agricultural laborers did not even secure the barest livelihood, but were compelled, not by way of exception, but as a matter of rule, to eke

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out their wages by the assistance which they derived from the Poor Law.

In his history of the time Mr. Spencer Walpole thus speaks of the state of the laboring poor :

"For many years the condition of the laboring classes in Britain had been growing more and more intolerable. The old conditions of labor had been changed, and the laborer had suffered from the change. Before the latter half of the eighteenth century the great mass of the laboring poor had been scattered throughout the country, owing to an almost feudal allegiance to, and deriving some corresponding advantages from, the neighboring landlord. But the discoveries of the eighteenth century terminated these conditions. The manufacturing industries of the country were collected into a few great centres, and the persons employed in these manufactures necessarily accompanied them. In one sense they had their reward : the manufacturers gave them better wages than the farmer, and better wages were of no slight advantage to the laborer. In another sense their change of occupation brought them nothing but evil. Forced to dwell in a crowded alley, occupying at night-time a house constructed in neglect of every known sanitary law, employed in the daytime in an unhealthy atmosphere, and frequently on a dangerous occupation, with no education available for his children, with no reasonable recreation to cheer his leisure, with the blue sky of heaven shrouded from his view by the smoke of an adjoining factory, with the rich face of Nature hidden from him by a brick wall, neglected by an overworked clergyman, regarded as a mere machine by an avaricious employer, the factory operative naturally turned to the only places where relaxation was possible, and sought in the public-house, the prize-ring, or the cock-pit the degrading amusements which were the business of his leisure. . . .

"It so happened that, while the condition of the town operative was gradually becoming more and more wretched, the position of the country laborer was also changing for the worse. The old feudal ties which had hitherto connected the squire with his peasantry were being gradually loosened by the teachings of political economy. Improved agriculture and the introduction of machinery into farming were also altering the economy of rural districts. In the eighteenth century there were few large farms,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there were comparativedy few large fields; the corn was reaped by hand; the winters were passed in threshing it out by the flail; and the farmers had consequently work for their laborers at every season of the year. Threshing-machines altered this condition. They deprived the laborers of the demand which had previously existed for their work in the winter; and the farmers, in consequence, altered their system of hiring, and engaged the men, whom they had previously taken for a year, by the week. It so happened, too, that the vast reclamations of waste land which were made during the war pressed severely on the laboring poor. The common, on which every cottager had kept his cow, was annexed to the huge estate of the adjoining landlord, and the laborer found himself compelled to give up the beast which he had no longer the means to support. In many cases enclosures deprived the rural laborers of much more than their cow. They had been permitted, when the land was supposed to be worthless, to erect a little building on one side of the common, and to convert the patch of ground around it into a garden. In the eye of the law these men were squatters: they had no title to the cottage which they had erected or to the ground which they had reclaimed. The good of the country required the reclamation of wastes, and the little garden in the middle of the common came within the new fence-line of the rich squire. The cottage was demolished, the garden was ploughed up, and the cottager sank, at one blow, from the position of a small farmer, with a little house of his own, into that of a lodger at another cottage, whose sole source of livelihood was the wage which he received for his labor.

"The enclosures had been the indirect means of occasioning a considerable injury to the poor. But the Legislature, when it sanctioned them, had not foreseen the injury; on the contrary, it was universally imagined that the additional land which was brought into cultivation would increase the demand for labor, and so produce a permanent benefit to the laboring classes. The result, however, did not justify these expectations. The better wages which the laboring classes in a few instances received for a time were a poor compensation for the cow, the pig, and the goose which they were no longer able to keep. 'Before the enclosures,' said a laborer to Arthur Young, 'I had a good garden, kept two cows, and was getting on. Now I cannot keep so much as a goose, and am poor and wretched.' In a short time, moreover,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the miserable laborers were deprived of the solitary advantage which increased wages had given them. The prospect of additional work led to early marriages, and to a consequent multiplication of their numbers. The peace, and the lower prices which succeeded it, did away with the new work and added to the number of laborers. Arable land was thrown into pasture; paid-off soldiers and sailors returned to their parishes; and the rate of wages fell and fell continually. Dazzled by the prospect of increasing the food of the people, the Legislature had enabled the landowners to plough up the common, and to throw down the humble enclosure of the cottager. The common was again turned into pasture; but it was supporting the squire's beasts, and not the peasant's. The peasant had seen his garden seized, his cottage demolished, his cow sold, his family impoverished, but the land growing no more corn, and receiving no more culture than before. The cry which Isaiah had raised 2,000 years before came home to the miserable laborer, and was repeated by the most eloquent, though not the wisest, of his advocates in Parliament: 'Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth.'"

This wretched condition of things was aggravated by the state of the Poor Law. Pauperism had reached perfectly frightful dimensions. At one time in 1833 the poor rate amounted to twelve shillings per head of the whole population, and it was estimated that one in seven, counting every man, woman, and child, was in receipt of Poor-Law relief. Crime rose in the same proportion as pauperism. In spite of an atrocious criminal code, which, at the beginning of the century inflicted capital punishment for no less than 200 offences, and which was not materially changed till twenty years later, the number of criminals continued to increase. Even the ameliorations which were made in the code produced at first no diminution in the number of criminals, which reached its highest level in 1842, when there were 31,000 committals for trial in a single year. In fact, it is probable that the stringency of the law in the earlier period led to laxity in its administration, and many persons escaped altogether because the penalty prescribed was altogether disproportionate to the offence. It has been reserved for modern times to reap the full advantage both of the alteration of the laws and the improvement in the character of the popula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. Last year, with a population which has nearly doubled, the total number of committals was only 13,000, while the nature of the crimes committed was certainly less serious than in former periods. In a single year—in 1834—480 human beings were sentenced to death, and the great majority were executed. Last year the capital sentence was pronounced in thirty-five cases, in twenty-one of which the full penalty was exacted.

It is no wonder that crime was rife when all the conditions were unfavorable to civilized existence. The working classes were expected to toil from early morning till late at night in buildings unprovided with the most ordinary sanitary arrangements. Wages were sometimes paid in truck, and often at the public-house, where a large part of the weekly earnings was spent before they were actually received. There was no leisure for any kind of mental improvement; there was no opportunity for innocent recreation. Brutal punishments and brutal amusements offered the chance of excitement to wearied bodies and jaded minds. Thrift was an unknown virtue, and when the wages were more than enough to keep body and soul together they were spent in coarse dissipation or cruel pastimes. There were no Factory Acts; there was no Mines Act; and there was no Truck Act. Women and children were forced to work as long as, or longer than, the men, and they were brutalized and degraded by the conditions of their labor. In the mines it was worse than it was above ground. We read of women almost without clothing laboring for sixteen hours a day, and of little children, with chains round their waists, dragging heavy weights along passages worse than the ordinary common sewer. Not only the health of the living was destroyed, but the health of future generations was seriously threatened.

I have spoken of the sanitary condition of Birmingham; but this was certainly no worse than the rest of the country. Typhus, which is the consequence of overcrowding and insufficient food, was prevalent in all the large towns and in many country places. In Liverpool alone 30,000 people were living in 8,000 underground cellars; while in Manchester one-eighth of the people were housed, if housing it can be called, in the same fashion. It was in these circumstances that an intelligent foreign observer—a German economist who visited England between forty and fifty years ago—wrote that he found by personal observation that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state of the working classes of Great Britain was deplorable and intolerable, and he predicted an inevitable and imminent revolution. English witnesses no less impartial and intelligent were equally gloomy in their predictions of approaching evil, and they seemed to be justified by the fact that the state of the laboring poor was getting worse instead of better. Mr. McCulloch, the economist, writing in 1845, expressed the belief that the condition of the laboring classes had deteriorated in the previous twenty-five years; while Lord John Russell in 1844 said: "If we compare the condition of the working classes with what it was a century ago,—say 1740,—it is impossible not to see that, while the higher and middle classes have improved, and increased their means of obtaining comforts, of obtaining foreign articles of luxury and facilities of travelling from place to place, the laboring classes—the men who either till the soil or work in factories—have retrograded, and cannot now get for their service the quantity of the necessaries of life they could a century ago."

Happily, things were at their worst. The tide turned, and it has flowed in the direction of improvement ever since. Legislation has done much, philanthropy has done something, and the intelligent efforts of the working classes themselves have done more. All these things combined have helped to make our country a healthier and happier and a better place than it was half a century ago. The burden of national taxation has been reduced, especially the proportion paid by the poorer classes. At the present time, if a workingman does not smoke or drink, he can hardly be said to be subject to any taxation at all beyond the four pence per pound which he pays on his tea and the small contribution which he makes indirectly through the post-office. Pauperism has greatly diminished, and the poor rate is certainly less than half of what it was before the new Poor Law. Crime has diminished in quantity, and has, on the whole, been mitigated in its character. Education has been brought within the reach of every workingman's child and within the means of every parent. Protection has been afforded against excessive toil and overwork; and the observance of proper sanitary conditions for labor has been universally enforced. The laws against combinations have been repealed, trades-unions have been legalized, and the workmen are able to meet the employers on more equal terms in the settlement of the rate of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wages. The care of the public health has been recognized as a public duty and enforced both upon individuals and the local authorities. The trammels have been removed from industry; the taxes on food and on all the great necessaries of life have been repealed; facilities of travel and of inter-communication have been largely extended and developed; opportunities of self-improvement and recreation have been afforded to all at the cost of the community; and last, but not least,—since this is perhaps the indirect cause of many of the other results named,—the suffrage has been widened, until now every householder, however poor and however humble, has a voice in the government of his country and his full share of influence in the making of its laws.

It is not easy to measure the change which has taken place by statistics, but it may be illustrated by the following figures: Mr. Giffen, our most eminent living statistician, made a careful inquiry some time ago into the rate of wages at different periods, and he found that in the last fifty years they had advanced from 50 to 100 per cent. In the same time the hours of labor have been reduced on an average by 20 per cent. In very few trades do they now ever exceed ten hours, while in the majority they average nine hours, and in many they have been reduced to eight. The means for an innocent and profitable use of the leisure which has thus been afforded have been supplied by the action of the municipal and local authorities. Not only have the wages improved, but the cost of living has diminished. Bread is 20 per cent. cheaper on the average; sugar is 60 to 70 per cent. cheaper; tea, 75 per cent. cheaper; clothing, 50 per cent. cheaper. The cost of fuel, as represented by coal, has been diminished by one-half. Light, in the shape of gas or petroleum, is infinitely better and very much cheaper than in the time when tallow rushlights were the only illumination within the reach of the poor. Locomotion has become easy and is placed within the reach of all; while the postage of letters, which averaged a shilling apiece, is now reduced to a uniform penny, or, in the case of postcards, to one halfpenny for each communication. Only one article of commerce of great importance has increased in price, and that is meat in the shape of mutton and beef. Fifty years ago, however, mutton and beef did not enter into the ordinary consumption of the working classes; and if they tasted meat at all it was only in the shape of bacon. House rent has also risen, and in the course

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the time of which we are speaking it has probably doubled. But house rent is a test of prosperity; and it is just because the working classes can afford to give themselves better accommodation that we find this great increase in the rate of house rent.

On the whole, it may truly be said that not only have the working classes more to spend, but that they are able to get more for the money which they do spend. This is confirmed by the extraordinary increase which has taken place in the consumption of the chief articles of food. Thus, for instance, the consumption of sugar is four times per head as much as it was fifty years ago; tea, three and a half times as much; rice, sixteen times; eggs, six times; and tobacco, twice as much. And lastly, in consequence, perhaps, of the better food and living and of the better house accommodation, as well as on account of the improved sanitary conditions, the death-rate has diminished, the health of the country has improved, and the expectation of life at the different age-periods is now from two to four years better than it was.

In the same fifty years the habit of thrift has been considerably developed. The working classes have had more money, and they have found it possible and advantageous to reserve a portion of their income as a provision against sickness and old age. During the half-century the depositors in the savings-bank have multiplied tenfold, and the amount of funds which have been placed there for security has increased from thirteen millions sterling to considerably over a hundred millions. In addition, there are coöperative societies with a million of members and fourteen millions of capital; building societies with fifty millions of liabilities; and friendly societies almost innumerable. With regard to the last, it is difficult to obtain exact returns, but in 1880 the Registrar reported that he had received returns from 12,687 societies, with 4,800,000 members and £13,000,000 invested funds. It is probable that the total figures are at least double those shown by these imperfect returns.

An impartial consideration of the facts and figures here set forth must lead to the conclusion that there has been a very great improvement in the condition of the people during the period under review, and that this improvement has been largely due to the intervention of the state and to what is called socialistic legislation. The acts for the regulation of mines and the inspec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of factories and workshops, the Truck Act (preventing the payment of wages in kind), the acts regulating merchants' shipping, the Artisans'-Dwellings Act, the Allotments Act (enabling local authorities to take land and to provide allotments for laborers), the Education Act, the Poor Law, and the Irish Land Acts are all of them measures which more or less limit or control individual action. The pedantic adherence to supposed fixed principles of political economy has been so frequently invaded by this legislation that few people would think it worth while to appeal to them as conclusive against further action, and it is recognized that each case must be decided on its merits, and cannot be determined on purely abstract grounds. The late Professor Stanley Jevons, in his essay on "The State in Relation to Labor," lays down the modern doctrine in these words: "The state is justified in passing any law, or even in doing any single act, which, without ulterior consequences, adds to the sum total of happiness. . . . The liberty of the subject is only the means towards an end. Hence when it fails to produce the desired result, it may be set aside and other means employed."

It appears, then, that experience has shown that in many instances great advantages have followed the extension of the functions of government, and that no sufficient objection exists to their further application when good cause can be shown. It must not be supposed that such cause does not still exist, or that the reforms already accomplished have exhausted the possibilities of statesmanship. Unfortunately it still remains true that in the richest country of the world the most abject misery exists side by side with luxurious profusion and extravagance. There are still nearly a million persons in the United Kingdom who are in receipt of parish relief, and as many more who are always on the verge of poverty. In our great cities there are rookeries of ignorance, intemperance, and vice, where civilized conditions of life are impossible, and morality and religion are only empty names. In certain trades unrestricted competition and the constant immigration of paupers from foreign countries have reduced wages to a starvation level, while there are other industries—as, for instance, shipping and railway traffic—where the loss of life is terrible, and the annual butcher's bill is as great as in a serious war. In the agricultural districts the divorce between the laborer and the soil he tills is still the fruitful source of distress to the poor and danger to the state.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Corn-Law rhymer, Ebenezer Elliott, represents the laborers of his time as

> "Landless, joyless, restless, hopeless,
> Gasping still for bread and breath,
> To their graves by trouble hunted,
> Albion's Helots toil till death";

and it will not be asserted that any marked or general improvement has yet taken place in the conditions of their labor.

These are the facts with which we have yet to deal; and the hope of the future lies in the awakening of the public conscience, and in its recognition of the duty of the community to its poorest and weakest members. We may be encouraged by the success of past efforts to persevere on similar lines, and to continue a policy which has been shown to afford practical results.

There is no need to abase the rich in order to raise the poor, and it is neither possible nor expedient to drag everything down to one dead level. We cannot, if we would, equalize the conditions and the capacities of men. The idler, the drunkard, the criminal, and the fool must bear the brunt of their defects. The strong, the prudent, the temperate, and the wise will always be first in the race. But it is desirable that the government, which no longer represents a clique or a privileged class, but which is the organized expression of the wants and wishes of the whole nation, should rise to a true conception of its duties, and should use the resources, the experience, and the talent at its disposal to promote the greater happiness of the masses of the people.

J. CHAMBERLAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WIMAN CONSPIRACY UNMASKED.

BY SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

DURING the last four years Mr. Erastus Wiman, a Canadian by birth, living in New York for twenty-six years, and claiming to be a British subject still, has conducted an active campaign, both in the United States and Canada, with the avowed object of bringing about complete free trade between those two countries.

The Hon. Mr. Laurier, the leader of the opposition in the Canadian House of Commons; Sir Richard Cartwright, who held the office of Finance Minister in Mr. McKenzie's administration from 1873 to 1878; and Mr. Edward Farrer, the principal writer on *The Globe* newspaper, the organ of the opposition, have been vigorously coöperating with Mr. Wiman, in the press of the United States and Canada and at public meetings and banquets in both countries, in an endeavor to excite the hostility of the administration, Congress, and the people of the United States against the Liberal Conservative government and party of Canada, and to show that the opposition have been the friends of the United States, and are now prepared to establish free trade between the two countries.

In the January number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW Mr. Wiman says:

"A condition of commercial belligerency exists along the entire northern border of the United States. . . .

"Whatever may have been the motive, or whatever may be the outcome, the policy of the Tory party has certainly been in the direction of isolation. To this must be attributed the harsh and antiquated interpretation of the fishery treaty—the refusal of hospitality to a few fishing-smacks in Canadian ports, while enjoying an unbounded hospitality for British and Canadian ships in every port of the United States. To this policy must be credited the denial of bonding privileges for a few quintals of fish, while enjoying unlimited bonding privileges from the United States, without which Canadian railroads would rapidly reach bankruptcy. The same idea prevails in the discrimination against United States vessels in the canals, the creation of which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was only justified by the patronage of these craft. . . . This catalogue of Tory achievements, supplemented by the guerrilla railroad warfare which, owing to the enforcement of the United States inter-State regulations, threatens to ruin American railway investments, and which the Canadian government is accused of encouraging, makes the indictment complete. . . .

"What, therefore, under the circumstances is the best plan by which to abate the commercial belligerency that prevails along the northern border of the United States? If the people in this country cannot conquer, cannot purchase, and cannot lure to a political alliance the people of Canada, can a commercial bargain be made with them by which free access can be had to their sources of enormous wealth, and to the profits of a trade that their development will create? The answer is that nothing is easier of accomplishment than this commercial bargain. . . .

"It is most important, at this juncture, that the results of a Liberal victory should be perfectly understood. In the first place, the Liberal party are unequivocally committed to the principle of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. . . .

"Again, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States implies that American goods are not only to be admitted free of duty, but for the purposes of revenue, and to prevent Canada from being the back door of smugglers into the United States, the duty on foreign goods will be maintained at the present rates. . . . Thus there is proposed a discrimination in favor of American manufactures, which are to be admitted free, while British goods are practically prohibited by the exaction of a duty.

"Is it possible to conceive of a movement more significant in British North America than this attempt at fiscal freedom from British control? . . .

"That the people of Canada will consent to this arrangement there can be little doubt, especially since the agricultural section of the McKinley Bill has afforded an object-lesson of such stupendous import as to perfectly convince them that the commercial hostility heretofore indulged in can have but one result—that of complete isolation, loss, and disaster to the most important interests of the Dominion."

It may be added that Mr. Wiman has persistently denounced the Reciprocity Act of 1854 on the ground that it was unfair to the United States.

Sir Richard Cartwright has joined Mr. Wiman in denouncing the government for hostility to the United States, and in declaring their determination to secure unrestricted reciprocity with that country.

Mr. Laurier, at a public meeting at St. Hyacinthe, asserted: "The Conservative party has always shown itself hostile to the United States."

At Montreal on January 27, 1891, Mr. Laurier said: "Our relations with the United States are unworthy of a civilized country. We have not only not free commercial intercourse, but everything possible has been done by the government at Ottawa

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to render our relations with our neighbors disagreeable. In the future I wish it to be understood that there is in this country a political party well disposed to friendly intercourse with the Americans."

At a recent public meeting at St. Thomas he said:

"The President only asks to retaliate. Why retaliate? Why, sir, because in his judgment he would be compelled to do so by the unfriendly action of the Canadian government. If we are met with this state of things with which we are threatened, it is due to the vicious policy of the Canadian government in the administration of the rights secured to us by the treaty of 1818."

Mr. Wiman's charge of commercial belligerency is controverted by the fact that the tariff of Canada only averages about one-half of that of the United States. The public records of Canada effectually disprove the statement that the Liberal Conservative government of Canada has been unfriendly to the United States.

The Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, the present Premier, was a member of the government that obtained the ratification of the treaty of 1854.

Under that treaty an enormous expansion took place in the trade between the United States and Canada. It was denounced by the United States, and terminated in 1866, although the balance of trade during its operation was no less than $95,575,957 in favor of the United States, in addition to their use of the fisheries of British North America.

Mr. Wiman, nevertheless, denounces that treaty as "a jug-handled policy" which should not be renewed by the United States.

On the 5th February last Mr. McCreary, a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said in Congress, as reported in *The Congressional Record*: "Bound together as this nation and Canada are by race, language, tradition, and similar institutions, with Canadian territory running hundreds of miles into the United States, and the United States territory running hundreds of miles around Canada, with great transcontinental lines of railway connecting and cementing the two countries, it is difficult now to understand why the reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada should have been terminated in 1866. Canada is a grand market for our products, and a magnificent source of supply."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The government of Sir John A. Macdonald, in its great desire to avoid the interruption of the harmonious relations that had grown up under the operation of that treaty, allowed the fishermen of the United States the free use of our fisheries for a year after Canadian fish were compelled by the United States to pay duty.

Sir John A. Macdonald was one of Her Britannic Majesty's Joint High Commissioners who negotiated the treaty of Washington in 1871, which settled the "Alabama" claims and all questions then pending between the United States and Canada.

On submitting that treaty for the approval of the House of Commons, he was attacked by the so-called Liberal party, and charged with basely sacrificing the rights of Canada in his desire to promote friendly relations with the great republic.

Through that spirit which has always actuated his government, the American fishermen were allowed to enjoy the privileges accorded by the treaty for three months before it came into operation. When, twelve years afterwards, it was terminated by the United States, their fishermen were allowed to continue to enjoy our fisheries, without any consideration, for a full season.

Although Canada was then compelled to protect her rights under the treaty of 1818, upon which we were thrown back by the action of the United States, the following article from the Toronto *Globe,* the organ of the opposition, will show the spirit in which it was done :

"As their Congress refused to consent to the President's recommendation to nominate an international fisheries commission, there was no escape for Canada from the conclusion that the United States would not deal on the matter. Hence Canada had no option but to give up just as much as the Americans chose to take or to protect practically. Our complaint against the Ottawa ministers is that they did not protect the fisheries more completely."—*Globe* editorial, March 3, 1857.

When I had the honor, as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, to assist in the negotiation of the Washington treaty of 1888, we agreed to a treaty which President Cleveland declared was a fair and just settlement, and recommended its ratification. He thanked the British plenipotentiaries warmly for the *modus vivendi* voluntarily offered by us, under which all friction in reference to the Atlantic fisheries was removed.

President Harrison expressed in his inaugural address approval of that measure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When, however, I submitted that treaty and *modus vivendi* to the House of Commons, I was fiercely denounced by Mr. Laurier, Sir Richard Cartwright, and other members of the Liberal party, for having surrendered everything in my desire to obtain friendly relations with the United States.

These are the evidences to be found on the public records of the country of the real attitude of the two parties in Canada towards our neighbors. How ill informed Mr. Wiman is when he undertakes to instruct the people of the United States and Canada may be learned by the perusal of his sworn testimony before the committee of the Senate appointed July 31, 1888, where he stated that American vessels had taken out 500 licenses each year under the *modus vivendi*, and that those licenses gave them power to catch bait and fish—the fact being that the largest number of licenses taken out in Canada in any one year was 119, and that they gave no power to catch bait or fish!

Again, Mr. Wiman has endeavored to excite hostility in the United States by charging the Canadian government with discriminating against American vessels using our canals. No such discrimination exists. Canada has expended $41,000,000 on the canals from Lake Erie to Montreal, and is now expending $12-000,000 more to complete a fourteen-foot navigation throughout. Of this, $24,000,000 have been spent on the Welland Canal. Of the 1,104,553 tons of freight which passed through that canal in 1889–90, more than eleven-twelfths came from or was going to United States ports. All vessels coming from and going to the same ports pay the same tolls on our canals, whatever their nationality may be.

The assistance given by the Canadian government to railways has never been in any spirit of hostility to the United States, but simply as a means of developing Canada. The manner in which Mr. Wiman gloats over the McKinley Bill as a great object-lesson to aid in "The Capture of Canada" leaves no room to doubt that this measure, so far as it affects Canada, was prompted by Mr. Wiman and his associates, Sir R. Cartwright and Mr. Farrer. True to their vocation of preventing good feeling between the United States and Canada from being brought about by any reciprocal-trade arrangement between the two countries, they endeavored to paralyze the Canadian government in any negotiations with the United States by the declaration that they would be swept from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power by the voice of the people in twelve months. Sir John A. Macdonald, seeing the injury that such a statement would inflict upon any negotiations at Washington, promptly remitted that question to the people at the polls. Brought face to face with the people, Mr. Wiman was at once discarded by his associates, Mr. Laurier and Sir R. Cartwright, who declared against the adoption of the United States tariff. Mr. Laurier's address to the electors and country contained these words: "Moreover, the assertion that unrestricted reciprocity means discrimination against England involves the proposition that the Canadian tariff would have to be assimilated to the American tariff. I deny the proposition." The organ of the opposition in Nova Scotia took the same ground as did Sir R. Cartwright and the party generally. The New York *Tribune* at once denounced the position taken by Mr. Laurier and his party in the following terms:

"It [the Halifax *Morning Chronicle*] argues in favor of unrestricted and absolute reciprocity between Canada and the United States, with each country at liberty to adopt such tariff as it may prefer, and represents this, and no more than this, as the deliberate purpose of one party in the Canadian contest. If this is the fact, one party of Canadians closely resemble the baby which cried for the moon and got into a rage because the moon would not consent to be grasped. This nation has not the slightest notion of allowing Canada to open the back door as wide as it may please, while tariff enactments by the United States are closing the front door against sundry importations at New York and Boston. If any one is silly enough to suppose such a plan is entertained by Americans, he does not live in this country. All such representations may as well be put aside as utterly and widely at variance with anything Americans can possibly be brought to adopt."

Yet the country has witnessed the singular spectacle of Mr. Wiman, thus thrown over, apparently, and discredited by all his associates except Mr. Farrer, devoting all his time and energies to lobbying Congress, begging it to pass a resolution to influence an election in a foreign country. To the honor of Congress, it refused thus to degrade itself, and left Mr. Wiman to manipulate his unveiled treason without the aid which he had so unblushingly sought.

The charge of "traitorism" is one which Mr. Wiman has fastened upon himself. In his brochure in your January number, entitled "Can We Coerce Canada?" Mr. Wiman says:

"It should always be borne in mind that the whole body of politics in Canada is permeated through and through with loyalty to the British throne,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for which universal sentiment there is hardly cause for surprise. It must be remembered that Great Britain has treated Canada with the utmost liberality; that the Canadians are a practically self-governing community; and that, in addition to loans of British money in amounts second only to the vast credits given the Argentine Republic, which have recently brought such disaster in financial circles in London, no interference has been made, and nothing but kindness and generosity extended. To contemplate the cessation of a sentiment of loyalty to Great Britain, and to transfer the allegiance of a whole people to her great rival, is simply to contemplate a condition of traitorism that no political party could for one instant afford to assume."

Mr. Wiman boasts that he is a British subject; yet after he had propounded his scheme for commercial union in an address to the Boot and Shoe Club at Boston in January last, when exception was taken to it by Mr. Murray on the ground that it did not insure the annexation of Canada to the United States, the Boston *Herald* of January 22 reports:

"Mr. Wiman briefly replied to the arguments used by Mr. Murray. The speaker urged that, if it was desired to lessen the power of England, that end could not be accomplished better than by Canada trading with the United States and ceasing to trade with Great Britain. 'The very thing Mr. Murray wants to accomplish,' said Mr. Wiman, 'will be better accomplished by the plan I propose than by the plan he proposes.'"

If that is not sufficient, read Mr. Wiman's sworn evidence, page 752 of testimony taken by the Senate commission.

"Suppose your commission should report in favor of unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States; then suppose at the next general election, which takes place within the next eighteen months, the Liberal party, adopting that as the sole plank in their platform, should be returned by a large majority, and Parliament should take on a commercial-union or unrestricted-reciprocity complexion: they would be in control of the government; they would meet your invitation by a vote; that would have to go to England to be consented to by the royal authorities. . . .

"Suppose the English government refused; then the Canadians would be relieved from their fealty, which would be as much a justification for a Boston tea-party as there was in 1776 or prior. . . .

"So that nothing could contribute so much to bring about annexation, if it is thought in the end to be desirable, as to have closer commercial relations."

Brought face to face in the recent campaign with the electors, Sir Richard Cartwright declared that the opposition would not take the United States tariff, and repudiated his own henchman,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Farrer. Mr. Laurier went further and denied that their policy of unrestricted reciprocity involved discrimination against England. But the ugly fact remained that Mr. Wiman, convicted by the letters of Mr. Farrer and Mr. Hitt of being engaged in a treasonable conspiracy to subvert British institutions in Canada, still implored for "moral support" from Congress and the people of the United States for the Laurier-Cartwright party, and the government were sustained by a larger majority than they had at the previous general elections. To complete the discomfiture of the opposition, this was followed by the publication of a letter from the Hon. Edward Blake, one of the most able and respected members of that party, who, rather than bind himself to their policy, had ceased to be their leader, and who now declares that his refusal to go into the battle with them was because he was "unable to fight under false colors." Mr. Blake, who to-day represents the great body of the opposition, who, with few exceptions, are loyal to British institutions, has rudely torn the "mask" to which Farrer alluded from the faces of the conspirators, and the delusion of unrestricted reciprocity may be regarded as dead and buried.

CHARLES TUPPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

BY THE MOST HON. THE MARQUIS OF LORNE.

WE IN England and in Canada always desire to be most respectful to America, and to all Americans, including Mr. Wiman, whom we would still like to think of as the engaging Toronto youth he once was. But little boys will grow up, and some young Canadians will become full-grown Americans, and we do not feel disposed to quarrel with this decree of Providence, however often we may heave a sigh and say, "What a nice little boy it once was!" Especially in the pages of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW are we always most respectful to our cousins of the United States; else we should not be admitted into the pages of that patriotic print, nor could our words reach the sixty millions of readers everybody knows it commands.

Thus disposed in our mind, we were prepared to find that Mr. Wiman, writing in these pages, would be more American than the Americans; just as Mr. Van Horne, of a good old New York family, is now, as president of the Canadian Pacific, more Canadian than are many "Kanucks." We did not expect to find any trace of the exuberance of Ontario in his pages, but, to our surprise, we do. He still remembers some of the phrases of his neighbors of early days, and he still speaks of the dividing-line between the United States and Canada crossing the continent rather to the south of a line of equal division between the two nationalities. He says with pride that Canada possesses more than half of the continent, thereby placing the warm side of his heart close against the north pole. He also concedes that Canada is "loyal" in the sense of liking the old country, although he thinks that a mantle of union jack conceals a waistcoat and coat of stars and stripes.

But where his Americanism comes in is where he generously disposes of all the north to the United States after a generation has passed away. Then will there be but one country, in his belief, and all the frozen portion of the continent shall be thawed by being placed in Uncle Sam's lap. Although he thinks the United States are as yet indifferent to the great good he means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to bring them by this annexation in another score of years, he insists that they shall have Labrador, the shores of Hudson's Bay, and the Mackenzie River. So much cold water may well damp annexation ardor; but are not all Americans said to be fond of drinking iced water, and what, under these circumstances, can the prospect of owning so much of it bring but pleasure? Ungenerous doctors sometimes say that a great deal of dyspepsia comes from over-indulgence in iced water; but no, Mr. Wiman does not believe it, and Uncle Sam must drink of the waters of the St. Lawrence, Athabasca, and Mackenzie, and call them his. He must "cast his shoe" over this land he is said not to want, and trample out all individualism in French Canada, and among the descendants of the English loyalists, because trade connections along a strip of frontier can be made better. "Great God, what do we see and hear, the end of things created?" Yes; all yields to a little more trade connection. Patriotism, loyalty, pride in country and in the continuity of its history, in its institutions, in its freedom, that gives its people now a sovereign power, all—all must go before a little more—if only a percentage—of increased trade connection!

Horace said that they who crossed the sea changed the sky only, not the mind. But our friend has only gone a few hundred miles from his old home, and lo! a changed mind indeed. Do his old fellow-countrymen agree with that mind? Let the continuance in power of the Prime Minister who is opposed to Mr. Wiman's ideas answer the question. Sir John Macdonald has been at the head of the government for much more than the time, "the passing of a generation," which Mr. Wiman claims as sufficient for the plans he favors, and has been kept in power for that long period because Canada believes that she would be called upon to sacrifice her independence if she had her tariff dictated at Washington instead of at home.

There are many reasons why the United States should regard with indifference any attempt to "round up" Canada into the Union. The American policy has always been to make her people as homogeneous as possible. It is not possible to do so in the South, where the negroes, in spite of ancient Southern prophecies to the contrary, will go on increasing in a far greater ratio than can, in a hot country, the white population. But elsewhere the United States system is to grind into one English-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speaking democratic community all foreigners and their descendants who settle in America. German boys are chaffed at school out of their German. Frenchmen hardly attempt to go as settlers, and their fate is the same if they do; for even in the South, where conditions are more favorable to the retention of peculiarities, where there are few but negroes around, witness the decay of French in Louisiana. English, English everywhere,—in school, in the counting-house, in all affairs of life.

Now, in Canada there is a great population of French-speaking Catholics, who refuse thus to be amalgamated, and who rejoice in their province of Quebec, in their own laws, language, institutions. It is a population constantly growing, and the most sturdy in physique on the continent. To try to absorb this population would be one of the cold-water draughts that would give Uncle Sam dyspepsia. It is difficult to say whether they would vote Republican or Democratic. Certain it is that they would puzzle the wire-pullers, and, owing to their rapid natural increase in numbers,—few families among them having less than eight children,—the problem of their management would be more difficult to solve as time passed.

But even without taking into account the difficulties involved in the absorption of a wholly foreign race such as the French Canadian, there are other reasons which may well excuse the indifference with which any project for the annexation of Canada is regarded in the United States. The country in that mighty union of commonwealths is already so vast that it provides itself easily with all that is needful, and gives its central government already sufficient occupation. It is often remarked how indifferent the Mississippi-valley population are to the interests of the East, as shown in the manner in which they question the utility of spending money on a powerful navy and the arming of the Atlantic ports. The same tendency may be observed among the rapidly-increasing people of the Pacific coast. And this happens in spite of the more rapid communication constantly insured to an ever-increasing degree by the construction of railroads.

The tendencies to what the Germans call "particularism" are always latent in so huge a bundle of sticks. Patriotism may scout the idea as traitorous, but there are other causes besides that which produced the Southern "Rebellion," capable of being nurtured into disaffection to a central government. Phrases are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

awkward things when they have a wide bearing, and the "sovereignty" of each State is a phrase that may be grown into a growth not wholly compatible with a due relegation into the shades of obedience. Is it worth while to add to the vast districts already under the sway of the Washington government one that has cherished a separate sentiment and constitution for a time equal to the period of the life of the American nation itself?

Augustus knew when to check the wings of victory, so that the empire he ruled should not be overweighted with its own immensity. The peoples on the north of the St. Lawrence and the lakes have lived for a century and a half under a rule which is wholly different from that type brought into existence in the States. It is one where the democracy, proud of the continuity of their history as symbolized by the crown, has no strong bureaucracy fixed in power over it. It changes the government as it chooses by the votes of its representatives, sitting in an assembly where the ministers have also seats, and can be questioned by the independent or by the opposition members. This is a species of liberty unknown in the constitution of the United States; and it may fairly be said that the Canadians, when they formed their union of colonies in 1867, took most of what is best in the British constitution, most of what is best in the American, and left behind them the antiquated absurdities of the British, at the same time rejecting the more novel defects which have become apparent in the American. They had the benefit of the experience of the old world and the new world for their guidance. Goldwin Smith and a few other essayists may sneer at the Governor-General as a figurehead, and at the title "Sir" given to eminent men in office or at the head of the learned professions in Canada; but they must be conscious that these trivial personalities must be taken for the crotchets they represent by their utterance, and that a system which is alive because it suits a free people cannot be hindered by the few bacilli who do not find their surroundings suited to the further propagation of their little crooked species.

Whatever we may think as to the relative advantages of the two types of government to the north and the south of the international boundary, certain it is that the northern type is one that has educated a whole people to regard it as good, and to look upon the southern type as faulty. Is it for the advantage of the United States that there should be within its borders a northern tier

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or two of new States looking to the Canadian form of monarchical institutions as insuring more liberty than can be obtained under a republican form? or is it not best to keep on developing these countries under the flag of the federal government at Washington, whose people have grown up under and been accustomed to the presidential type, more autocratic than the monarchical? It will be long before the territories now under the southern government are so filled with men that more elbow-room is wanted. Until that time comes, would it not be best for the most enthusiastic believer in the old Monroe Doctrine to waive the right of conquest, whether by arms or by bribery?

It will be said that there is little use in discussing an annexation for which nobody specially cares; the American people having enough to do at home, and not being possessed of any covetousness for their neighbor's goods. So it is in the main; but if the main body allow a few energetic individuals, whether they be secretaries of state from near the frontier or humbler members of Congress, to pursue a policy of pressure through diplomatic devices, or congressional acts raising the tariff against their agricultural neighbors over the frontier line, there may well be misunderstanding as to the attitude of indifference. It is more likely that it will be assumed that, judging from appearances, there is a fair amount of disposition to engulf the smaller nation.

It is probably only the northern row of States who desire it. But if, as the official announcement says, there is no desire on the part of the United States to engulf Canada, or on the part of Canada to be annexed, is there no intermediate result aimed at by the heightening of the American tariff, and the refusal to consider the free interchange of raw products only? Yes; there is, first, commercial union, which the advocates of annexation believe will lead to their object being attained.

As I write, the news of the result of the elections in the Dominion is published, and a sufficient working majority returned to support Sir John Macdonald's policy has told the world that Canada wishes to pursue her own path. Commercial union cannot be based on any abiding certainty, as Mr. Blake has pointed out, so long as there are two points of control, one at Washington and one at Ottawa. So long as such a dual management exists, commercial union would repose on no assured foundation. The Washington management would necessarily demand more and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more power over the joint arrangement, which might be liked in the southern capital, but would hardly be appreciated in the northern. The paddling of your own canoe becomes a manifestly unnecessary performance when the canoe is hauled along by a powerful propeller ahead of her.

"Quite so; then why paddle at all?" the reader will ask; and the answer must be that the paddlers think their mode of propulsion rapid enough, and that their craft is better adapted than is the steamer to their waters, and can exploit them better, as answering better to the exigencies of the currents and more easily launched on fresh waters that may open up before the voyager. It is, in other words, the love of their own; the love of that land their fathers went to and believed in when no one else believed in her; the love of fulfilling the hopes of their fathers; the love in the pride of much done under many difficulties; the love of freedom which is assured to them by the rule they themselves have fashioned as they chose; the proud affection of manly hearts for the promise of a great future to be greatly earned—this is the sentiment that makes Canada wish to paddle her own canoe. Now, let us see if this is altogether the folly that our too comfortable critic, Mr. Wiman, imagines it to be.

Canada was "once upon a time" a mere string of settlements stretching along the United States boundary, disconnected with each other, and cherishing rather the memory of early trials than the hope of any assured fortune. What is she now? The string of settlements has widened out into a splendid zone of prosperous provinces, steadily increasing in wealth, in population, in power of intercommunication, and in the development of undreamed-of mineral and agricultural wealth. The article Mr. Wiman wrote in this REVIEW may talk in too lofty a strain about more than half a continent, when part of it is likely to be used only to supply the world with ice; but he does not exaggerate when he speaks of the large value of Canada's raw products. Coal, gold, silver, nickel, copper, iron, belong to her in immense quantities. Wheat, wood, and barley are abundant, and the furs of the far north almost justify the phrase we have just taken exception to as being too magniloquent. These resources she possesses in a territory which, under the old flag, she has made her own in peace and happiness. More land towards the "divide" that separates the St. Lawrence from the Hudson's Bay slope is always being occupied.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A railway reaches now one hundred miles north of Quebec. Behind the Ottawa there is plenty of land as good as that which has made the French Canadian happy in his earlier home. Lines, again, penetrate now to the North Saskatchewan. Great tracts of oil-bearing strata have been discovered even further north. It is evident that the vein of good country is no shallow or niggardly strip, but a broad belt in which the white man, like the wheat, attains the greatest strength of body.

Grumblers there always will be. Some point to emigration to the States. But with a redundant increase does not every prosperous state pour its "overflow" into the United States? Does any one say that Germany is a decaying power because her superabundance finds an outlet in the States? So in Canada does her abundance overflow, taking its way along the railways to places where wages are highest at the moment. But she is, at the same time, steadily filling her own borders. I hear a moan from Toronto, from one too hasty patriot, about the "empty" northwest. If he had travelled there when I traversed that country, only ten years ago, and compared its state then with its state after one decade, he would not have called it "empty," but "preëmpting." There is eagerness to get the best lands there, because they are being taken up. Then the revenue throughout the provinces at large has been steadily augmenting, and the vast sums spent in promoting public works belong to that class of state expenditure called in India "reproductive."

Ten years ago not a single member of the Canadian government had ever seen the northwest. The present Minister of the Interior, to whose thoughtful energy much of the success of our Indian policy is due, was not then in the cabinet, but at the head of the Indian administration on the plains. If any one had predicted, only in Lord Monck's time, that in 1891 there would not be a buffalo on the prairies, but thousands of prosperous farms, he would have been considered a queer crank. In every department of national prosperity, in settlement, good agriculture, enterprise in mining and lumbering industry, in the fisheries, everywhere from east to west definite and steady progress of the best type, not spasmodic, but sure and lasting, is visible to the stranger, if certain natives shut their eyes to it. The factories that have arisen have sprung into being since a certain tariff has been imposed on foreign manufacturers. Undoubtedly in a country capable of much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development, and exposed to the hostile action of more powerful rival factories, such a measure of protection is legitimate, if by this only the beginning of industrial enterprise of this description can be planted. Some economists speak of supply and demand as if those terms included all circumstances. But through human ingenuity, "rings" and devices of combination can keep all the supply to themselves, and do much to regulate the demand. It is no answer to this that in the long run the eternal principles will reassert themselves. So they may when the generation who sees them insulted are in their graves.

Canada has had ample cause to know that combination in trade among her more powerful neighbors may "slaughter" her factories, and that the prices show, in spite of the massacre of their innocent infant factories, no abatement. I repeat, therefore, that, when a country has great natural wealth to safeguard and exploit for her own people, the protective tariff may often be necessary to plant factories. This is considered heresy in England, but England, under similar circumstances to those of Canada, would do precisely the same. She is now a seething factory in mid-channel between the old and the new world, and her interests now are to take all she can of raw and manufactured goods, because her territories are too small to let her people live except as general brokers on their own and other nations' products. Canada is small in population, but vast in land and latent resource, and she gets the capital of the old world to develop her latent wealth. She can well afford to draw most of her revenue from import duties, for she becomes stronger every year to bear any strain.

Let it not be imagined, then, that a high tariff against her agricultural products enacted in the States will turn more than a few frontier countries in favor of a plan that would deprive her of "ruling her own roost." Her border countries have developed faster than those of the New England States contiguous to her. The progress of the Quebec population has been mentioned with the admiration it deserves. Ontario has sent many of her sons to the northwestern territories and Manitoba, as well as to the United States, and is quite as well off as corresponding districts south of the line. Yes, everywhere the conviction is growing that along those grand parallels of latitude can be built up a nation worthy to find its place in the world, worthy to stand near its great neighbor to the south, able to achieve what it designs,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to make itself respected by an independence which is too real to be aggressive, and too honest to be subservient. Thus Canada tells the mother-land that she wishes to live on in alliance with her, and under her flag to make the treaties which shall be correlative to her own extending commerce. Thus she tells the States that she desires to be friendly with them, to live alongside of them and work with them for the civilization of the continent, in all amity and good neighborhood.

And here I must protest against the utterly unfounded language Mr. Wiman is pleased to use regarding what he calls Canada's unfriendly attitude to the United States in some matters, such as the fisheries, salvage on the lakes, and such like. If he had taken the smallest pains to look through the history of these small matters of difference incidental to the rivalries, not of nations, but of all neighboring communities, he would have found in the past of his own people, whose conduct he thus shamefully traduces, the most eager desire to be generous to their neighbors while just to themselves. In regard to protection of fisheries, does not Maryland protect her oyster-beds by armed cruisers against poaching? Do the salvage combinations of the cities southwest of the lakes do less than do the Canadians to guarantee the proper earnings of their salvage vessels? Is he unaware of the special order issued by Mr. Mackenzie Bowell, Minister of Customs, as long ago as 1880, that no vessel should ever be left in distress, and that it did not matter whence came the aid, from Americans or Canadians, so long as the succor was afforded?

To represent the Canadian government in any other light than as a most friendly neighbor is a mischievous and wholly unfounded statement. The underwriters on both sides of the lakes have a trade interest in salvage, and the northern vessels are quite competent to assist any ship in trouble; but the government have gone out of their way to assure the southern salvage companies that all assistance will be welcomed in case of trouble where the local succor may be retarded. It is wholly wrong to attribute, in this or any other international relation, the slightest want of friendship. So it is represented that goods in bond are not equally allowed to pass the frontiers. Again this is not the case, all goods in bond being allowed to pass, except those few articles reserved by treaty, such as fish and fish oil. Again, it is not the case that there is unequal treatment in regard to canal traffic. All vessels

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are allowed to pass all canals under equal rates, whether Canadian or American. It is difficult to conceive the motive of these imputations, coming as they do from a Canadian born ; and perhaps it is best in this case to stick very rigidly to the polite rule of comity that asks us not to impute any motive.

The *modus vivendi*, or license system, at present in force is a most striking instance of the desire of the northern people to be friendly. No country can ever be worthy of friendship if it does not respect itself by enforcing its undoubted rights, and this is all that has been done. And this is the action that must necessarily be pursued. Any unrestricted reciprocity would benefit alone the few farmers in frontier countries. It would swamp the manufacturers and give the more numerous nation to the south entire control of the northern market, while Canada would not have the market of the 60,000,000, but be at their mercy as to the disposition of her trade. She prefers to direct her own destiny, and is conscious of her duty to herself. Her trade with the United States increased greatly during the term of the treaty negotiated in 1854 and broken off by the Americans in 1866. The breaking of that treaty, which we suppose Mr. Wiman would reckon among the most neighborly of the acts of the Washington government, was one of the causes that led to the union of the Canadian provinces.

Since those days the provinces have yearly become more and more knit together, and the practical common-sense of their peoples has told them that they can form a nation, and have a voice to which men shall listen. The old world, as well as the new, believes this confidence to be well founded, and freely invests in her mines, her railways, and her municipal bonds. New lines of steamers are about to connect her yet more with the trade of Europe and Asia. Should the United States be neighborly, they will arrange that some such treaty as that which lasted for twelve years, and was advantageous to the border countries on both sides, be again enacted. Should they refuse, the interruption will but make more visible that bright spark of patriotism whose light has before now illuminated the darker passages of Canada's history, and will become yet more intense as the mighty motive power of national life makes her move with an ever-firmer step towards that future she is conscious she will inherit.

LORNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NAPOLEON'S VIEWS OF RELIGION.

BY H. A. TAINE.

THE church is a mighty force, a distinct, permanent social influence of the highest order, and every political calculation in which it is omitted, or in which it is treated as of little consequence, is unsound. Every head of a state, therefore, who would estimate the vastness of this influence must consider its nature.

I.

This is what Napoleon does. As usual with him, in order to see deeper into others, he begins by examining himself. "To say from whence I came, what I am, or where I am going, is above my comprehension. I am the watch that runs, but unconscious of itself." These questions, which we are unable to answer, "drive us onward to religion; we rush forward to welcome her, for that is our natural tendency. But knowledge comes and we stop short. Instruction and history, you see, are the great enemies of religion, disfigured by the imperfections of humanity. . . . I once had faith. But when I came to know something, as soon as I began to reason, which occurred early in life, at the age of thirteen, I found my faith attacked and that it staggered." This double personal conviction is an after-thought, when preparing the concordat. "It is said that I am a Papist. I am nothing. In Egypt I was a Mussulman; here I shall be a Catholic, for the good of the people. I do not believe in religions. The idea of a God!" And then, pointing upward: "Who made all that?" The imagination has decorated this great name with its legends. Let us content ourselves with those already existing; "the disquietude of man is such that he cannot do without them; in default of those already made he would fashion others, haphazard, and still more strange. The positive religions keep man from going astray; it is these which render the supernatural definite and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

precise; he had better take it in there than elsewhere, . . . at Mademoiselle Lenormand's, in the stories got up by every adventurer, every charlatan, that comes along." An established religion "is a kind of vaccination which, in satisfying our love of the marvellous, guarantees us against quacks and sorcerers; the priests are far better than the Cagliostros, Kants, and the rest of the German mystics." In sum, illuminism and metaphysics, the speculative inventions of the brain and the contagious overexcitement of the nerves, all the illusions of credulity, are unhealthy in their essence, and, in general, anti-social. Nevertheless, as they belong to human nature, let us accept them like so many streams tumbling down a slope, except that they remain in their own beds, and, in many of them, no new beds, and not in one bed alone by itself. "I do not want a dominant religion, nor the establishment of new ones. The Catholic, Reformed, and Lutheran systems, established by the concordat, are sufficient." With these one need not grope one's way in the unknown. Their direction and force are intelligible, and their irruptions can be guarded against. Moreover, the present inclinations and configuration of the human soil favor them; the child follows the road marked out by the parent, and the man follows the road marked out by the child. For instance:

"Last Sunday, here at Malmaison, while strolling alone in the solitude enjoying the repose of nature, my ear suddenly caught the sound of the church bell at Ruel. It affected me, so strong is the force of early habits and education! I said to myself, What an impression this must make on simple, credulous souls!" Let us gratify these; let us give back these bells and the rest to the Catholics. After all, the general effect of Christianity is salutary. "As far as I am concerned, I do not see in it the mystery of the incarnation, but the mystery of social order, the association of religion with paradise, an idea of equality which keeps the rich from being massacred by the poor. . . . Society could not exist without an inequality of fortunes, and an inequality of fortunes without religion. A man dying of starvation alongside of one who is surfeited would not yield to this difference unless he had some authority which assured him that God so orders it, that there must be both poor and rich in the world, but that in the future, and throughout eternity, the portion of each will be changed."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alongside of the repressive police exercised by the state there is a preventive police exercised by the church. The clergy, in its cassock, is an additional spiritual *gendarmerie*, much more efficient than the temporal *gendarmerie* in its stout boots, while the essential thing is to make both keep step together in concert. Between the two domains, between that which belongs to civil authority and that which belongs to religious authority, is there any boundary line of separation? "I do not see where to place it; *its existence is purely chimerical.* I look in vain; I see only clouds, obscurities, difficulties. The civil government condemns a criminal to death; the priest gives him absolution and offers him paradise." In relation to this act both powers operate publicly in an inverse sense on the same individual, one with the guillotine and the other with a pardon. As these authorities may clash with each other, let us prevent conflicts and leave no undefined frontier; let us trace this out beforehand; let us indicate what our part is and not allow the church to encroach on the state.

The church really wants all; it is the accessory which she concedes to us, while she appropriates the principal to herself. "Mark the insolence of the priests who, in sharing authority with what they call the temporal power, reserve to themselves all action on the mind, the noblest part of man, and take it on themselves to reduce my part merely to physical action. They retain the soul and fling me the corpse!" In antiquity, things were much better done, and are still better done now in Mussulman countries. "In the Roman republic, the senate was the interpreter of heaven, and this was the mainspring of the force and and strength of that government. In Turkey, and throughout the Orient, the Koran serves as both a civil and religious bible. Only in Christianity do we find the pontificate distinct from the civil government." And even this has occurred only in one branch of Christianity. Everywhere, except in Catholic countries, "in England, in Russia, in the northern monarchies, in one part of Germany, the legal union of the two powers, religious control in the hands of the sovereign," is an accomplished fact. "*One cannot govern without it;* otherwise, the repose, dignity, and independence of a nation are disturbed at every moment." It is a pity that "the difficulty cannot be overcome as with Henry VIII. in England. The head of the state would then, by legislative statute, be the supreme chief of the French church."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unfortunately, France is not so disposed. Napoleon often tries to bring this about, but is satisfied that in this matter "he would never obtain national coöperation"; once "embarked," fully engaged in the enterprise, "the nation would have abandoned him." Unable to take this road, he takes another, which leads to the same result. As he himself afterwards states, this result "was, for a long time and always, the object of his wishes and meditations. . . . It is not his aim to change the faith of his people; he respects spiritual objects and *wants to rule them* without meddling with them; his aim is *to make these square with his views, with his policy,* but only through the influence of temporal concerns." That spiritual authority should remain intact; that it should operate on its own speculative domain, that is to say, on dogmas, and on its practical domain, namely, on the sacraments and on worship; that it should be sovereign on this limited territory, Napoleon admits, for such is the fact, and we have only to open our eyes to see it. Right or wrong, spiritual authority is recognized sovereign through the persistent, verified loyalty of believers, obeyed, effective—in other words, a powerful force. It cannot be done away with by supposing it non-existent; on the contrary, a competent statesman will maintain it in order to make use of it and apply it to civil purposes. Like an engineer who comes across a prolific spring near his manufactory, he does not try to dry it up, nor let the water be dispersed and lost; he has no idea of letting this remain inactive; on the contrary, he collects it, digs channels for it, directs and economizes the flow, and renders the water serviceable in his workshops. In the Catholic Church, the authority to be won and utilized is that of the clergy over believers and that of the sovereign pontiff over the clergy. "You will see," exclaimed Bonaparte, while negotiating the concordat, "how I will turn the priests to account, and, first of all, the Pope!"

"Had no Pope existed," he says again, "it would have been necessary to create him for the occasion, as the Roman consuls created a dictator under difficult circumstances." He alone could effect the *coup d'état* which the First Consul needed, in order that he might constitute the new head of the government a patron of the Catholic Church, to bring independent or refractory priests under subjection, to sever the canonical cord which bound the French clergy to its exiled superiors and to the old order of things, "to break the last thread by which the Bour-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bons still communicated with the country." "Fifty *emigré* bishops in the pay of England now lead the French clergy. Their influence must be got rid of, and to do this the authority of the Pope is essential; he can dismiss or make them resign." Should any of them prove obstinate and unwilling to descend from their thrones, their refusal brings them into discredit, and they are "designated as rebels who prefer the things of this world, their terrestrial interests to the interests of heaven and the cause of God." The great body of the clergy along with their flocks will abandon them; they will soon be forgotten, like old sprouts transplanted whose roots have been cut off; they will die abroad, one by one, while the successor, who is now in office, will find no difficulty in rallying the obedient around him, for, being Catholic, his parishioners are so many sheep, docile, taken with externals, impressionable, and ready to follow the pastoral crook, provided it bears the ancient trademark, consists of the same material, is of the same form, is conferred from on high, and is sent from Rome. The bishops having once been consecrated by the Pope, nobody save a Gregory or some antiquarian canonist will dispute their jurisdiction.

The ecclesiastical ground is thus cleared through the interposition of the Pope. The three groups of authorities thereon which contend with each other for the possession of consciences—the refugee bishops in England, the apostolic vicars, and the constitutional clergy—disappear, and now the cleared ground can be built on. "The Catholic religion being declared that of the majority of the French people, its services must now be regulated. The First Consul nominates fifty bishops whom the Pope consecrates. These appoint the curés, and the state pays their salaries. The latter may take the oath, while *the priests who do not submit are sent out of the country*. Those who preach against the government are handed over to their superiors for punishment. The Pope confirms the sale of clerical possessions; he consecrates the Republic." The faithful no longer regard it askance. They feel that they are not only tolerated, but protected by it, and they are grateful. The people revere their churches, their curés, the forms of worship to which they are almost instinctively accustomed, the ceremonial which, to their imagination, belongs to every important act of their lives, the solemn rites of marriage, baptism, burial, and other sacramental offices.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henceforth mass is said every Sunday in each village, and the peasants enjoy their processions on Corpus-Christi day, when their crops are blessed. A great public want is satisfied. Discontent subsides, ill-will dies out, the government has fewer enemies; its enemies, again, lose their best weapon, and, at the same time, it acquires an admirable one, the right of appointing bishops and of sanctioning the curés. By virtue of the concordat and by order of the Pope, not only, in 1801, do all former spiritual authorities cease to exist, but again, after 1801, all new titularies, with the Pope's assent, chosen, accepted, managed, disciplined, and paid by the First Consul, are, in fact, his creatures, and become his functionaries.

Over and above this positive and real service obtained from the sovereign pontiff, he awaits others yet more important and undefined, and principally his future coronation in Notre Dame. Already, during the negotiations for the concordat, La Fayette had observed to him with a smile: "You want the holy oil dropped on your head"; to which he made no contradictory answer. On the contrary, he replied, and probably too with a smile: "We shall see! We shall see!" Thus does he think ahead, and his ideas extend beyond that which a man belonging to the ancient *régime* could imagine or divine, even to the reconstruction of the empire of the west as this existed in the year 800. 'I am not the successor of Louis XIV.," he soon declares, "but of Charlemagne. . . . I am Charlemagne, because, like Charlemagne, I unite the French crown with that of the Lombards, and my empire borders on the Orient." "Had I returned victorious from Moscow, I intended to exalt the Pope beyond measure, to surround him with pomp and deference. I would have brought him to no longer regretting his temporality; I would have made him an idol. He would have lived alongside of me. Paris would have become the capital of Christendom, and I would have governed the religious world the same as the political world. . . . I would have had my religious as well as legislative sessions; my councils would have represented Christianity; *the Popes would have been merely their presidents.* I would have opened and closed these assemblies, sanctified and published their decrees, as was done by Constantine and Charlemagne." The Pope, as with the marshals and the new dukes, must have a landed income settled on him, consisting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of "property *in different parts of the empire,* two millions of rural revenue free of all taxation." Necessarily the Pope must have two palaces, one at Paris and the other at Rome. He is already nearly fully installed in Paris, his person being all that was lacking. On arriving from Fontainebleau, two hours off, he would find everything belonging to his office; "the papers of the missions and the archives of Rome were already there." "The Hôtel Dieu was entirely given up to the departments of the court of Rome. The district around Notre Dame and the Ile St. Louis was to be the headquarters of Christendom." Rome, the second centre of Christendom, and the second residence of the Pope, is declared "an imperial and free city, the second city of the empire"; a prince of the empire, or other grand dignitary, is to reside there and "hold the court of the emperor." "After their coronation in the cathedral of Notre Dame at Paris, the emperors" will go to Italy before the tenth year of their reign, and be "crowned in the church of St. Peter at Rome." The heir to the imperial throne "will bear the title and receive the honors of the King of Rome." Observe the substantial features of this chimerical construction. Napoleon, far more Italian than French, Italian by race, by instinct, imagination, and souvenir, considers in his plan the future of Italy, and, on casting up the final accounts of his reign, we find that the net profit is for Italy and the net loss is for France. Since Theodoric and the Lombard kings, the Pope, in preserving his temporal sovereignty and spiritual omnipotence, has maintained the sub-divisions of Italy; let this obstacle be removed and Italy will once more become a nation. Napoleon prepares the way, and constitutes it beforehand by restoring the Pope to his primitive condition, by withdrawing from him his temporal sovereignty and limiting his spiritual omnipotence, by reducing him to the position of managing director of Catholic consciences and head minister of the principal cult authorized in the empire.

In carrying out this plan, he will use the French clergy in mastering the Pope, as the Pope has been made use of in mastering the French clergy. To this end, before completing the concordat and decreeing the organic articles, he orders for himself a small library, consisting of books on ecclesiastical law. The Latin works of Bossuet are translated for him, and he has drawn up an exposition of the Gallican parliamentary doctrine. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first thing is to go down to the roots of the subject, which he does with extraordinary facility, and then, recasting and shaping the theories to suit himself, he arrives at an original, individual conception, at once coherent, precise, and practical; one which covers the ground and which he applies alike to all churches, Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, and even Jewish, to every religious community now existing and in time to come. So long as belief remains silent and solitary, confined within the limits of individual conscience, it is free, and the state has nothing to do with it. But let it act outside these limits, address the public, bring people together in crowds for a common purpose, manifest itself visibly, it is subject to control; forms of worship, ceremonies, preaching, instruction, and propagandism, the donations it provokes, the assemblies it convenes, the organization and maintenance of the bodies it engenders, all the positive applications of the inward rosary, are temporal works. In this sense, they form a province of the public domain, and come within the competency of the government of the administration, and of the courts. The state has a right to interdict, to tolerate, or to authorize them, and to direct their activity at all times. Sole and universal proprietor of the outward realm in which single consciences may communicate with each other, it intervenes, step by step, either to trace or to bar the way; the road they follow passes over its ground and belongs to it; its watch, accordingly, over their proceedings is, and should be, daily; and it maintains this watch for its own advantage, for the advantage of civil and political interests, in such a way that concern for the other world may be serviceable and not prejudicial to matters which belong to this one. In short, and as a summary, the First Consul says, in a private conversation: "The people want a religion, and this religion should be in the hands of the government!"

II.

A few months after the publication of the concordat, Mademoiselle Chameron, an opera-dancer, dies, and her friends bear her remains to the Church of St. Roch for interment. The curé, very rigid, "in a fit of ill-humor," refuses to officiate, and he shuts the doors of the church; a crowd gathers, which shouts and launches threats at the curé; an actor makes a speech to appease

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tumult, and finally the coffin is borne off to the Church of Les Filles St. Thomas, where the curé, "familiar with the words of the gospel," performs the funeral service. Incidents of this kind disturb the tranquillity of the streets and denote a relaxation of administrative discipline. Consequently the government, doctor in theology and canon law, intervenes and calls the ecclesiastical superior to account. The First Consul, in an article in the *Moniteur*, haughtily gives the clergy their countersign and explains the course that will be pursued against them by their prelates. "The Archbishop of Paris orders the curé of St. Roch into a retreat of three months, in order that he may bear in mind the injunction of Jesus Christ to pray for one's enemies, and, made sensible of his duties by meditation, may become aware that these superstitious customs, which degrade religion by their absurdities, have been done away with by the concordat and the law of Germinal 18." Henceforth all priests and curés must be prudent, circumspect, obedient, and reserved, for their spiritual superiors are so, and could not be otherwise. Each prelate, posted in his diocese, is maintained there in isolation; a watch is kept on his correspondence; he can communicate with the Pope only through the Minister of Worship; he has no right to act in concert with his colleagues; all the general assemblies of the clergy, all metropolitan councils, all annual synods, are suppressed.

The church of France has ceased to exist as one corps, while its members, carefully detached from each other and from their Roman head, are no longer united, but juxtaposed, confined to a circumscription like the prefect; the bishop himself is simply an ecclesiastical prefect, a little less uncertain of his tenure of office; undoubtedly his removal will not be effected by order, but he can be forced to send in his resignation. Thus, in his case, as well as for the prefect, his first care will be not to excite displeasure, and the next one, to please. To stand well at court, with the minister and with the sovereign, is a positive command, not only on personal grounds, but for the sake of Catholic interests. To obtain scholarship for the pupils of his seminary, to appoint the teachers and the director that sent him, to insure the acceptance of his canons, cantonal curés, and his candidates for the priesthood, to exempt his sub-deacons from the conscription, to establish and to defray the expenses of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chapels of his diocese, to provide parishes with the indispensable priest, with regular services, and with the sacraments, requires favors, which favors cannot be enjoyed without manifestations of obedience and zeal, and, more important still, without devotedness.

Besides all this, he is himself a man. If Napoleon has selected him, it is on account of his intelligence, knowing what he is about, open to human motives, not too rigid and of too easy conscience; in the eyes of the master, the first of all titles has ever been a supposable, docile character, associated with attachment to his person and system. Moreover, with his candidates, he has always taken into consideration the hold they give him through their weaknesses, vanity, and necessities, their ostentatious ways and expenditure, their love of money, titles, and precedence, their ambition, desire for promotion, enjoyment of credit, right of petitioning, of prestige, and the establishment of social relationships. He avails himself of all these advantages and finds that they answer his purpose. With the exception of three or four saints like Monseigneur d'Avran or Monseigneur Dessolles, whom he has inadvertently put with the episcopate, the bishops are content to be barons and the archbishops counts. They are glad to rank higher and higher in the Legion of Honor; they loudly assert, in praise of the new order of things, the honors and dignities it confers on these or those prelates who have become members of the legislative corps or been made senators. Many of them receive secret pay for secret services, pecuniary incentives in the shape of this or that sum in ready money. In total, Napoleon has judged accurately; with hesitation and remorse, nearly the whole of his episcopal staff, Italian and French, sixty-six prelates out of eighty, are open to "temporal influences." They yield to his seductions and threats; they accept or submit, even in spiritual matters, to his final determination.

Moreover, among these dignitaries, nearly all of whom are blameless, or, at least, who behave well and are generally honorable, Napoleon finds a few whose servility is perfect, unscrupulous individuals ready for anything, whatever an absolute prince could desire, like Bishops Bernier and De Pancemont, one accepting a reward of 30,000 francs and the other the sum of 50,000 francs for the vile part they played in the negotiations for the concordat; or miserly, brutal, cynic-like Maury, archbishop of Paris; or an intriguing, mercenary sceptic like De Pradt, arch-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bishop of Malines; or an old imbecile, falling on his knees before the civil power, like Rousseau, bishop of Orleans, who indites a pastoral letter declaring that the Pope is as free in his Savona prison as on his throne at Rome. After 1806, Napoleon, that he may control men of greater suppleness, prefers to take his prelates from old noble families—the frequenters of Versailles, who regard the episcopate as a gift bestowed by the prince and not by the Pope, a lay favor reserved for younger sons, a present made by the sovereign to those around his person, on the understood condition that the partisan courtier who is promoted shall remain a courtier of the master. Henceforth nearly all his episcopal recruits are derived from "members of the old race." "Only these," says Napoleon, "know how to serve well."

From the first year the effect arrived at is better than could be expected. "Look at the clergy," said the First Consul to Roederer; "every day shows that in spite of themselves their devotion to the government is increasing, and much beyond their anticipation. Have you seen the pastoral declaration of Boisgelin, archbishop of Tours? He says that the actual government is the legitimate government, that God disposes of thrones and kings as he pleases; that he adopts the chiefs whom the people prefer. You yourself could not have said that better." But, notwithstanding that this is said in the pastoral letter, it is again said in the catechism. No ecclesiastical publication is more important; all Catholic children have to learn this by heart, for the phrases they recite will be firmly fixed in their memories. Bossuet's catechism is good enough, but it may be improved,—there is nothing that time, reflection, emulation, and administrative zeal cannot render perfect! Bossuet teaches children "to respect all superiors, pastors, kings, magistrates, and the rest." "These generalities," says Portalis, "no longer suffice. They do not give the proper tendency to the subject's submission. The object is to centre the popular conscience on the person of Your Majesty." Accordingly, let us be precise, make appointments, and secure support. The imperial catechism, a great deal more explicit than the royal catechism, adds significant developments to the old one, along with extra motives: "We specially owe to our Emperor, Napoleon the First, love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, and tributes ordained for the preservation of the empire and his throne. . . . For God has raised him up

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for us in times of peril that he might restore public worship and the holy religion of our fathers and be its protector." Every boy and girl in each parish recite this to the vicar or curé after vespers in their tiny voices as a commandment of God and of the church, as a supplementary article of the creed. Meanwhile the officiating priest gravely comments on this article, already clear enough, at every morning or evening service; by order, he preaches in behalf of the conscription and declares that it is a sin to try to escape from it, to be refractory; by order, again, he reads the army bulletins giving accounts of the latest victories; always by order, he reads the last pastoral letter of his bishop, a document authorized, inspired, and corrected by the police. Not only are the bishops obliged to submit their pastoral letters and public instructions to the censorship; not only, by way of precaution, are they forbidden to print anything except on the prefective presses, but again, for still greater security, the bureau of public worship is constantly advising them what they must say. First of all, they must laud the Emperor; and how this must be done, in what terms, and with what epithets, so that without indiscretion or mistake they may not meddle with politics, may not seem like a party managed from above, may not pass for mouthpieces, is not indicated, and it is a difficult matter. "You must praise the Emperor more in your pastoral letters," said Réal, prefect of police, to a young bishop. "Tell me in what measure." "I do not know," was the reply. Since the measure cannot be prescribed, it must be ample enough. There is no difficulty as regards other articles.

On every occasion the Paris bureaux take care to furnish each bishop with a ready-made draft of his forthcoming pastoral letter —the canvas on which the customary flowers of ecclesiastical amplification are to be embroidered. It differs according to time and place. In La Vendée and in the west, the prelates are to stigmatize "the odious machinations of perfidious Albion," and explain to the faithful the persecutions to which the English subject the Irish Catholics. When Russia is the enemy, the pastoral letter must dwell on her being schismatic; also on the Russian non-recognition of the supremacy of the Pope. Inasmuch as bishops are functionaries of the empire, their utterances and their acts belong to the Emperor. Consequently he makes use of them against all enemies, against each rival, rebel, or adversary,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Bourbons, against the English and the Russians, and finally against the Pope.

Similar to the Russian expedition, this is the great and last throw of the dice, the decisive and most important of his ecclesiastical undertakings, as the others are in political and in military affairs. Just as, under his leadership, he forces coalition of the political and military powers of his Europe against the Czar,—Austria, Prussia, the Confederation of the Rhine, Holland, Switzerland, the kingdom of Italy, Naples, and even Spain,—so does he force, under his lead, a coalition of all the spiritual authorities of his empire against the Pope. He summons a council, consisting of eighty-four bishops that are available in Italy and in France. He takes it upon himself to drill them and make them march. Toward the end the council is suddenly dissolved because scruples arise, because it does not yield at once to the pressure brought to bear on it, because its mass constitutes its firmness, because its members, standing close together, side by side, stand all the longer. "Our life is not good in the cask," said Cardinal Maury; "you will find it better in bottles." Accordingly, to make it ready for bottling, it must be filtered and clarified, so as to get rid of the bad elements which disturb it and cause fermentation. Some of the opposition are in prison, many have retired from their dioceses, while the rest are brought to Paris and cunningly worked upon, each member in turn, cautioned in a mess-room, *tête à-tête* with the the Minister of Worship, until all severally sign the formula of adhesion. On the strength of this, the council, purged and prepared, is summoned afresh to give its vote sitting or standing, in one unique session; through a remnant of virtue it inserts a suspensive clause in the decree, apparently a reservation, but the decree is still passed as ordered. Like the foreign regiment in an army corps which, enlisted, forced into line, and goaded on with a sharp sword, serves, in spite of itself, against its legitimate prince, unwilling to march forward to the attack, meaning at the last moment to fire in the air, so does it march and fire its volley notwithstanding.

Napoleon, on the other hand, treats the Pope in the same fashion, and with like skill and brutality. As with the Russian campaign, he has prepared himself for it long beforehand. At the outset there is an alliance, and he concedes great advantages to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Pope as to the Czar, which will remain to them after his fall; but these concessions are made only with a mental reservation, with the instinctive feeling and predetermination to profit by the alliance, even to making an independent sovereign, whom he recognizes as his equal, his subordinate and his tool. Hence this time, also, quarrels and war. His strategy against the Pope is admirable,—the entire ecclesiastical territory studied beforehand, the objective point selected, all disposable forces employed and directed by fixed marches to where the victory is to be decisive, the conquest extended and the seat of the final dominion established; the successive and simultaneous use of every kind of means—cunning, violence, seduction, and terror; calculation of the weariness, anxiety, and despair of the adversary; at first menaces and constant disputes, and then flashes of lightning and multiplied claps of thunder, every species of brutality that force can command; the states of the church invaded in times of peace, Rome surprised and occupied by soldiers, the Pope besieged in the Quirinal, in a year the Quirinal taken by a nocturnal assault, the Pope seized and carried off by post to Savona and there confined as a prisoner of state almost in cellular seclusion, subject to the entreaties and manœuvres of an adroit prefect who works upon him, of the physician who is a paid spy, of the servile bishops who are sent thither, alone with his conscience, contending with inquisitors relieving each other, subject to moral tortures as subtile and as keen as old-time physical tortures, to tortures so steady and persistent that he sinks, loses his head, "no longer sleeps and scarcely speaks," falling into a senile condition, and even more than senile condition—"a state of mental alienation." Then, on issuing from this, the poor old man is again beset; finally, after waiting patiently for three years, he is once more brusquely conducted at night, secretly and incognito over the entire road, with no repose or pity, though ill, except stopping once in a snowstorm at the hospice on Mont Cenis, where he comes near dying, put back after twenty-four hours in his carriage, bent double by suffering and in constant pain, jolting over the pavement of the grand highway until almost dead, he is landed at Fontainebleau, where Napoleon wishes to have him ready at hand to work upon. "Indeed," he himself says, "he is a lamb, an excellent, worthy man whom I esteem and am very fond of." A *tête-à-tête* not ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pected may probably prove effective with this gentle, candid, and tender spirit. Pius VII., who had never known ill-will, might be won by kindly treatment, by an air of filial respect, by caresses; he may feel the personal ascendency of Napoleon, the prestige of his presence and conversation, the invasion of his genius, inexhaustible in argument, matchless in the adaptation of ideas to circumstances, the most amiable and most imperious of interlocutors, stentorian and mild, tragic and comic by turns, the most eloquent of sophists, and the most irresistible of fascinators, who, on meeting a man face to face, wins him, conquers him, and obtains the mastery. In effect, after seeing the Pope for six days, Napoleon obtains by persuasion what he could not obtain afar by constraint. Pius VII. signs the new concordat in good faith, himself unaware that, on regaining his freedom and surrounded by his cardinals, who inform him on the political situation, he will emerge from bewilderment, be attacked by his conscience, and, through his office, publicly accuse himself, humbly repent, and in two months withdraw his signature.

Such, after 1812 and 1813, is the duration of Napoleon's triumphs and the ephemeral result of his greatest military and ecclesiastical achievements—Moskowa, Lutzen, Bautzen, and Dresden, the council of 1811, and the concordat of 1813. Whatever the vastness of his genius may be, however strong his will, however successful his attacks, his success against sections and churches never is, and never can be, other than temporary. Great historical and moral forces elude his grasp. In vain does he strike, for their downfall gives them new life, and they rise beneath the blow. With Catholic institutions, as with other powers, not only do his efforts remain sterile, but what he accomplishes remains inverse to the end he has in view. He aims to subjugate the Pope, and he led the Pope on to omnipotence. He aims at the maintenance and strength of the Gallican spirit among the French clergy, and he caused the dominion of the ultramontane spirit. With extraordinary energy and tenacity, with all his power, which was enormous, through the systematic and constant application of most diverse and extreme measures, he labored for fifteen years to sunder the ties of the Catholic hierarchy, tear this to pieces, and, in sum, the final result of all is to bind them together faster and hasten their completion.

H. A. TAINE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMON-SENSE ON THE EXCISE QUESTION.

BY WILLIAM S. ANDREWS, FORMER COMMISSIONER OF EXCISE IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AND THE REV. HOWARD CROSBY, D. D.

INTEMPERANCE in the use of intoxicants is among the chief promoters of poverty and crime, and constitutes one of the greatest evils of civilization. Society not only has the right—it is its duty—to protect itself, collectively and individually, against that evil. Such protection is not possible without a just and practicable system of excise regulation. In determining what that system should be, it must not be considered as a question of morals or sentiment, but purely as a matter of police—that is, what is necessary and best to protect the community from disorder and to prevent any encroachment by one person upon the rights of another. The intervention of law must be restricted to those things which concern the relations of men to other men. In those things which concern themselves only, human beings who have reached years of discretion and are of sound mind must govern themselves. It is only when the acts of the individual affect others that the State has any right to interfere; and then only so far as may be necessary to guarantee or protect the equal rights of all. Every attempt at excise regulation or restriction that does not recognize and obey this fundamental law of governmental science must fail.

If these essential principles be conceded, but two things are necessary for the successful operation of a just and practicable excise law. First, the law must be adapted to the requirements, habits, and customs of the people who are to live under it. Secondly, it must be strictly and impartially enforced.

The mere act of selling intoxicants does no harm. Evil or injury results from their use—or, more strictly, their misuse. It is necessary, therefore, to reach and control those who misuse them to the injury or detriment of others. As to the seller, it is sufficient that he shall neither induce nor permit the drinkers to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

go to excess, and that he shall maintain perfect order, decency, and cleanliness in and about his premises. The great majority of drinkers do not go to excess, and do not, as a result of their drinking, encroach upon the rights of others. The question as to whether they injure themselves is not to be considered, any more than if they eat too much or smoke too much, or do any other thing resulting in personal injury in which others are not involved. One man cannot be justly prevented from using anything because another man did, or may, abuse it. Not only is it a violation of the rights of the individual to attempt such prevention; it is worse than useless, because laws for such a purpose cannot be successfully enforced under a government like ours.

The habits of men can be regulated in a very limited degree by statute. Public opinion is more potent than all other forces combined in compelling enforcement of and obedience to law. Custom and fashion influence the conduct of the people in a far greater degree than legislative enactments. Legislative enactments not in conformity with the customs and desires of the people, and therefore not approved or sustained by public opinion, are uniformly disregarded. The attempt to enforce them under those conditions becomes a farce. It is not possible to compel obedience to them so long as there is ability to resist or evade.*

Such laws are far worse than no laws. They tend to engender a contempt for all law. But a much greater evil results—they inevitably breed corruption in the public service. Those whose duty it is to enforce them not only escape popular condemnation for their failure to do so, but frequently receive public approval and commendation for such failure. While thus relieved from all compulsion to enforce the law, its existence gives to corrupt officials the power to harass and pursue those who disobey it; not to compel obedience, but to extort pay for immunity in their disobedience. It is cheaper and easier for those who defy the law to purchase the privilege of doing so without molestation than it is

* In the recent able and learned address, delivered since the foregoing was written, by James C. Carter before the American Bar Association, that distinguished jurist said: "When a statute conflicts with the opinions, customs, and habits of a large part, although it may be a minority, of the community, it is difficult, and often wholly impossible, to enforce it. In many instances such enactments are absolutely futile. . . . No legislature can make what laws it will—that is, such laws as will be obeyed, and no others are properly laws. The substance of them [*i. e.* laws that will be obeyed] must be already found in the customs and habits of the people."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to attempt to evade interference. This leads to a most dangerous and demoralizing collusion between the official and the offender. For while this partnership may commence in an understanding regarding some minor requirement of law, the oath of office once broken and official honor once compromised, it is an easy step to more serious complicity, until crime in its worst forms finds immunity and shelter where it should meet detection and punishment.

An excise law, to be just and practicable, should have for its sole purpose the maintenance of public order without imposing or permitting any infringement upon the personal liberty of the citizen. It must not put restriction upon the peaceful and orderly pursuits or recreations of the people, but must interpose with a strong hand for the immediate and effectual suppression and punishment of disorder. It must protect the sober and orderly and deal summarily with the drunken and disorderly. Severe penalties should be inflicted upon all whose excessive use of alcoholic drink results in the neglect or injury of others dependent upon them for support. The occasional drunkard should be punished, and habitual inebriety treated either as a disease or a crime, the offender to be confined in an asylum or under legal restraint until cured or reformed. Any failure of an officer of the law to do his duty should be punished by immediate dismissal from and disqualification for office, and if a corrupt motive is shown, he should be mercilessly dealt with as a felon.

Strict and inflexible rules must be observed in granting licenses to sell alcoholic liquors. Public officials should be, as far as possible, deprived of discretionary power over licensees, either to ignore or condone offences against the law. The number of licensed places should be restricted within a limit to be determined solely with reference to public convenience.* The hours for opening or closing licensed places should be regulated with

* In 1886 the Board of Excise of the city of New York, of which the writer was then a member, made a rule that a new license for a drinking-place should not be issued except upon the expiration or surrender of an existing license. The operation of this rule not only prevented any increase in the number of existing drinking-places; it resulted in a gradual but certain decrease, because of the frequent expiration of licenses that were not renewed. In this way an actual reduction of several hundred saloons was effected during the term of that board. The rule is maintained by the present board, and must continue to work a reduction in the number of bar-rooms as long as it is faithfully enforced. This decrease, together with the growth of the city, will in a few years reduce the ratio of saloons to population below that of any other city in the State.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

due regard to the convenience and legitimate requirements of the neighborhoods where they are situated and of the citizens who patronize them. There are, for instance, in the city of New York certainly not less than fifty thousand persons whose ordinary occupations of life require them to labor during the night. About ferries and railway stations, in and about the markets and milk depots, and employed upon morning newspapers, they are compelled to labor while others sleep. They eat their meals in the night time, and there is no reason why they should not have the same opportunity to obtain such drink as is necessary for their comfort, during the hours when they labor, as other persons have during the day. The chief requisite of excise legislation is good order and the absence of any cause of annoyance and discomfort either to residents in the immediate vicinity of the licensed place or to the general public, whether it be day or night. The maintenance of those conditions is of far more importance than any restrictions as to the hours of selling.

A license should be revoked peremptorily and without discretion upon proof of the following offences: permitting the licensed premises to become disorderly, or to be used for any unlawful purpose, or to be connected with any place so used; or selling liquor to an intoxicated person, or knowingly permitting an intoxicated person to enter or remain upon the licensed premises; or knowingly selling liquor to an habitual drunkard. Upon the complaint of any citizen, or upon the knowledge or information of any excise or police official, of any nuisance or annoyance occurring in or arising from any licensed place, the licensee should be immediately summoned before the proper tribunal, and, if the complaint be sustained, for the first and second offences fined, and for the third offence the license should be revoked. An excise license should be transferable from one person to another, or to the legal representatives of a deceased licensee, upon the approval of the proper officers. The place should be licensed as well as the person, and a revocation of a license should carry with it a prohibition against relicensing either the person or the place for a term of years.*

The provision that when a license is revoked the place cannot be relicensed is more important than any other. It would do more than anything else to regulate and restrict the retail liquor

* That is the law in Great Britian.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traffic, and to drive disreputable and irresponsible persons out of the business. Premises licensed to sell liquor command higher rents than for any other purpose. The limitation of the number increases the value. The revocation of the license would mean to the landlord a loss of rent unless he was secured for the term during which the place must remain unlicensed, and he would therefore demand security. Only a responsible man of good character could, as a rule, give such security. In any case the licensee would be compelled to conduct his business properly, as a revocation of the license would involve him in a loss of the amount given in security, in addition to being driven out of the business for the term imposed. It would be a disaster to be avoided, very different from the consequence of a revocation where the business may be continued at the same place under another name and involving no loss beyond the value of the unexpired license.

The fees charged for licenses should not be excessive. The permission to sell intoxicants should not depend upon the ability to pay a large amount of money. It is proper to charge a fee for issuing the certificates of license, to pay the cost of the excise service; but the granting of the privilege to sell intoxicants should be based wholly upon the personal fitness of the applicant, upon the good order with which he conducts his business, upon the absence of annoyance to the public and to his neighbors, upon the fact that he does not sell liquor to habitual drunkards or to any person under the influence of liquor. There can be but two justifications for demanding a large money consideration for the privilege of selling liquor—either revenue or restriction. If for revenue, then the more places there are licensed the better. Revenue should be raised by tax. It should have nothing to do with permission to sell liquors. That is a matter which concerns the good order and well-being of the community, and should depend, as has been said before, wholly and solely upon the character and fitness of the person and place licensed. Restriction should be secured by limiting the number of licensed places.

Our existing excise laws bear most heavily upon our foreign population, who are for the most part good citizens, and not lawbreakers except when the laws appear to them unnecessary and opposed to their customs, habits, or religious convictions, or constitute an infringement upon their personal liberty, and when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they find it is not in their power to effect a change. Under such conditions our adopted citizens do just what native citizens do—they simply disregard the law so far as possible. Take, for example, the city of New York, a large proportion of whose citizens came from foreign lands, bringing with them the feelings, the habits, the sentiments, and the morals of the countries from which they came. The attempt to conform those people to our views, whatever they may be, must necessarily fail. The law, to be just and practicable, must be adapted to the habits, customs, and morals of all orderly and reputable persons in every community, however much they may differ in nationality and religion.

It is the duty of the government—and its only duty in that direction—to provide excise regulations adapted to the diverse elements comprising our population; giving to each individual, and each separate nationality or class, the utmost liberty to do that which to him or them seems right and proper to do, consistent with good order, the personal rights of each, and the well-being of the whole.

WILLIAM S. ANDREWS.

THE article on this subject by Mr. William S. Andrews is a masterly one, as might have been expected from a prominent member of the only good Excise Board the city of New York ever possessed. That board faithfully carried out the just principles enunciated in Mr. Andrews's article, and in consequence greatly reduced the number of saloons in New York. Mr. Andrews has had a large and intimate experience of the working of excise laws in a great city, and with that experience shows a philosophic and discriminating mind. I feel loath to object to anything put forth by so good an authority, and yet I am inclined to submit a few thoughts on his paper to his impartial judgment.

The fundamental principle which he upholds, that excise laws are for *police* purposes, and not for moral teaching, I most fully indorse. Law cannot make men moral. Law has as its end the quiet and order of the community, and as its means external and repressive applications. This principle is illustrated in excise laws by the limitations of a traffic readily abused, and so tending to disturb the community. So also I heartily agree with Mr. Andrews in his two propositions, that the law must be adapted to the requirements, habits, and customs of the people who are to live

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under it, and that it must be strictly and impartially enforced. But in the first of these two propositions I should have to add a sentence to prevent a misunderstanding from its present breadth. I should write it, that the law must be adapted to the requirements, habits, and customs of the people, *so far as those requirements, habits, and customs are not harmful to the public from a police stand-point.* Once in New York city it was the habit and custom of the citizens to let hogs run loose in all the streets. For many years this was the unhindered habit and custom. It was a dirty custom, and very prejudicial to comfort. When some citizens attempted to put an end to it, the cry was raised: "This is a time-honored custom, and by stopping it you would inflict a blow on our poorer population and on the liberty of the American citizen." Nevertheless, the handful of citizens carried their point and the filthy custom and habit of the city was squelched. Will any one to-day say that that law was unjust in stopping a venerable habit and custom?

A foreign population of a very low character come into New York, bringing with them some very objectionable customs and habits. They become a large portion of the community, settling in districts by themselves. Are we to indorse their customs and habits, however detrimental they may be to the public welfare? In all common-sense these people must give up their harmful customs and conform to the American standard. Laws made for that purpose are not be considered tyrannical, but reasonable. A local opposition must yield to the general will. Our Sunday laws belong to this category. The American people have from the start enjoyed a quiet Sunday, and they have found thrift and comfort by it. They will not give up the day to noise and riot, and foreigners cannot come here and destroy this day of refreshing and rest. Our laws protect us in it, and they who come to enjoy our prosperity must trust us in maintaining this important element of it. It is no law for religion, but for social order and refreshment. It only teaches religion by giving the religious majority, who keep the day religiously, a quiet day. It is also a hazardous thing to have the saloons open on any day when the people have nothing to do. The temptation is too great to drink to excess and promote public disorder. These are the solid bases of the Sunday laws, and all true Americans understand and appreciate their wisdom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Andrews says that the great majority of drinkers do not go to excess, and that is very true. But I would add here: "However, the great majority of drinkers *who frequent saloons* do go to excess." The saloon invites *excessive* drinking. Every inducement is held out for this. There the workingman is tempted to spend his wages and ruin his family. There the *treats* are made, and then come base words and quarrels and violence. Saloon-drinking is a great peril to the city, and thus comes under police surveillance. We can so far regulate by law the habits of the people as to remove the common cause of bad habits, and this is all that we propose that laws should do.

It is most wise advice of Mr. Andrews that public officials should, as far as possible, be deprived of discretionary power over licensees. The law's restrictions should be their only guide, and all opportunity of favoritism and bribery be removed.

I most strongly object to Mr. Andrews's plea for night saloons to accommodate persons who work at night. Night is the grand opportunity for crime. Our police system should especially be vigilant in the dark hours. Those who work at night should deny themselves some day privileges for the safety of the public. Night saloons would *necessarily* be the stamping-ground of the baser elements of the populace. There they would "prime up" for their nefarious deeds. The virtuous night-laborer would keep out of them, or, if he entered, would be contaminated by them. The police can tell us how even the hours from dark till 1 A. M. (when saloons in New York may be legally open) are the most dangerous hours in their experience. The grosser crimes of the city are largely traceable to the saloons in the night hours.

The only argument for high license-fees is the reduction of the number of the saloons. That this shuts out the poorer sellers is what all taxes do. It is a necessity of the case. We submit to it in all other departments of business. Poor men cannot run a rich establishment because the taxes are heavy. Poor men cannot enter the diamond trade. The taxes keep poor men from houses they might otherwise occupy. Where the welfare of the community is at stake, that argument cannot hold. If the number of saloons can be reduced otherwise than by high taxes, it ought to be done. The revenue argument for high license is worthless, unless we regard the amount raised as a help toward the extra expenses of the government caused by the evils of the trade. The number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saloons ought to be so limited that the police (faithfully performing their duties) might have complete oversight of every one of them. One saloon for every 1,000 of the community would give New York city 1,600 saloons, and that number is ample to supply all the drinkers. We now have 7,000. If we can bring down the number in this way, we need charge only such a license-fee as may help make the licensee careful to obey the law.

We all know that the retail liquor trade is a constant threat to the community. We all know that it needs, therefore, careful watching. But while we thus know, we would treat the sellers with all courtesy and justice, and maintain their rights.

Although I have offered some criticisms on Mr. Andrews's article, I repeat my thorough approval of the general principles he has so well laid down, and the admirable and impartial manner in which he has treated the subject, on which he is a valuable authority.

HOWARD CROSBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MODERN EXTINCTION OF GENIUS.

BY JULIEN GORDON.

I READ in a daily journal a short time ago an article of gloomy portent upon the decline in the number of writers of genius, and the yet sadder decadence in the quality of their gifts. The most deplorable aspect of tirades like this is the fact that there are many persons who will not only peruse, but believe them. It is only the very presumptuous who assert that they are uninfluenced by what they read. The cursory reader is but too prone to accept hastily the views and decisions at which he carelessly glances. The power of the pen is immensurable; one drop of printer's ink carries more weight than rivers of eloquence. Few men have the time, and few women the culture and patience, to think for themselves. They lack a certain stoutness of self-respect; they have a timorousness which pushes them to accept the narrowing iteration of platitudes. Our opinions are usually formed for us by somebody else, one thinker being sufficient for a community. Strangely enough there is in the average reader a low vitality, a certain tendency to the foreboding of evil, which serves to easily imbue him with unsound and fallacious dogmas in the domain of criticism.

To the inconsolable Jeremiahs who insist upon the superiority of writers of the past I would suggest that there are estimable elderly ladies who declare that men have lost all ardor, not to say politeness, in their commerce with the other sex; and at a dinner party last winter an old gentleman was heard to remark that he marvelled that truffles were still eaten, in the face of the fact that they had lost their flavor. There may be those who prefer the prose of Pherecydes of Syros to that of the present day. I would not molest them. There may be those who insist that the diction of our modern thinkers and poets and philosophers lacks the freshness of a Herodotus, the power of a Livy, the firework blaze of a Tacitus. To come nearer to our own day, there may be those,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again, who admire the writer—we will say of Addison's time—who began a poem or an oration by wildly invoking himself, his muse, and other people, with rending of the garments and tearing of the hair, lest his own or his reader's imagination should fail to be awakened. I will not go to the opposite extreme and underrate the old writers because their taste differs so frequently from ours; but when I compare one of these old-fashioned contortionists with the terse, breezy, and simple modern, with the directness and dignity with which he at once launches upon his theme, I cannot but feel that there has been growth. The modern has learned, it would seem to me, to avoid the bombast which exalts *outre mesure*, as well as the shoals of an undue frigidity which degrades and belittles all that it touches.

I will speak now only of modern fiction, and will dwell briefly even upon this theme. My space would not allow, if my modesty would permit, me to attempt the difficult task of a serious dissertation.

It would seem that, during the last hundred years, fiction, from being a mere trick of story-telling, has been raised into a loftier realm. It has, in fact, become a high art. The fine, close analysis of motive, the keen, trenchant observation of the human heart, the psychological study of the passions, so much in vogue at the present day, have placed it and its aims upon a different plane. It is no longer possible that an earnest and reflective generation should seriously occupy itself in following through three books and thirty chapters the rompings of an ill-conditioned schoolgirl with two or three insipid and mildly-adoring young gentlemen, until she is finally captured by one of them, at eighteen, and led to the altar, when the curtain falls to slow music upon a wedding-breakfast. I am not, of course, speaking now of a literature for the schoolroom and nursery. These have their uses. I am speaking of a literature for men and women of mature powers. Those who cannot find among living writers suitable aliment must be, indeed, peculiarly devoid of acumen and appreciation. Who, indeed, could have the courage to-day to wade through hundreds of pages full of peasants' dislocated dialect and servants' insignificant squabbles to find that a heroine of fifteen and her boy lover of seventeen, after a sufficient number of vicissitudes and hair-breadth adventures, were to be forever contented? I have often asked myself if in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

past days—since it is to be presumed that novelists paint the sentiments at the period in which they find them—it were possible that the tumults and tempests of the emotions filled the hearts of mere children at an age when our young men are preparing for college and our maidens playing with dolls. Either children matured earlier than now, or novelists were careless observers and noted little of the deeper and subtler experiences of ripe character.

Is it not absurd that we, who have the honor and the happiness of breathing the same air as a Tolstoï, a De Maupassant, a Meredith, a Stevenson, a Bret Harte, a Kipling, should be paralyzed and thwarted by this constant plaint of the insufficiency of present achievement? Why need the partisans of the departed be always under arms in an atmosphere charged with missiles? The past standards and our own cannot be the same; the necessary outcome of the times must make them different. When we have said that the present tendency is to simplicity and terseness, to the story and the *nouvelle* instead of the ponderous three-volume tome of the past,—we except the two longer romances of the great Russian,—we have said that change is in the order of life; that novelty is the touchstone which awakens imagination. We cannot believe that the afflatus of inspiration is even momentarily voiceless.

And first to turn to the Russians. I would wish to speak of Dostoiëvsky, the incomparable, the immortal, perhaps yesterday the greatest of modern novelists, but whose strange personality, whose restless, fevered brain, has found the hard-won victory, wrested at last from strife with poverty, injustice, and despair. But I will confine myself to living authors and narrow myself down to an anguish of modernity. First and foremost stands before us Tolstoï, the author of "War and Peace," of that sombre, soul-stirring story of "Katia," whose immeasurable art is almost drowned in the dark waves of its ineffable melancholy, and of the greatest novel of the century, "Anna Karénina." Shall it be said of Tolstoï that there is any one in the past who can overshadow him? make one star of his diadem to pale?—the pure moralist, the great artist, the poet-realist, who has laved his garments in the woes of humanity and held a world's pulsing heart in his giant palm?

Or, turning to the most perfect school of modern literary art, what have we in the past which can equal the vigor of the French style, conjoined with its exquisite elegance and finish? Who has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surpassed Daudet, with his masterpiece of "Les Rois en Exile"; De Maupassant, with his gems of "A Cheval," "Au Bois," and his late *étude* of a frightful, impotent warfare waged against a Providence which has doomed man so cruelly to watch the gradual processes of his own decay? Then have we not Paul Bourget, the baffled, cynical man of the world, masking the *naïf* with his protest of love and tears? How cool and clear his hand! how chaste his style, devoid of affectation of the turgid and the exaggerated!

And what shall be said of Robert Louis Stevenson, with his lurid questionings, whose answers have made men tremble? Has he no genius? And shall we not be thankful for our own Bret Harte, with his beautiful idyl, "In the Carquinez Woods," or his still deeper story of temptation and repentance, "The Twins of Table Mountain"?

What proves to us the abundance of contemporaneous talent is that such creations as Valera's "Pepita Ximenez" and Chesney's "Dilemma" are but the wonders of an hour. Mrs. Burnett, Charles Egbert Craddock, Howells, and a score of others—I name but half a dozen from a galaxy of brilliant writers—are artists whom it would be a folly to rank below their precursors. This depreciation of present art is not only uncritical; it is destructive. Has it not barked into dismay that fair child of the South whose genius we could ill spare? Talent cannot be killed: it may be silenced.

This pessimistic view is in some of the mourners a sign of senility, in others of immaturity. But while the plaints of age are always pathetic, those of the young are pointless and foolish—an oft-repeated magpie's cry, as exhausting to the bird upon the bough as to the man who sits under it. Beauty, sublimity, elegance, humor, wit, are not mere chimeras; they still breathe. We shall not learn them; they are ours. Let us dare, then, to be ourselves, to avoid those restraints, those timidities, imposed upon us by a generation which, having done with life, insists that life is done. The Lord said, "Let there be light," and there was light. The fiat for darkness has not yet gone forth, nor for a general amnesty of those forces which create the joy-giving beam. Life and light are eternal, and genius, immortal child, still beckons to all youth, smiling, with its divine invitation.

JULIEN GORDON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR BUSINESS PROSPECTS.

BY HENRY CLEWS.

THE prospects of business throughout the country, although they have been seriously clouded by a variety of causes during the past few months, are now in a fair way of appearing in a clearer and more definite light.

The retarding influences have either been removed or so modified as to render them less obstructive to the operation of the agencies at work to produce a healthy condition in the numerous arteries of trade and commerce.

Business is now recovering from a rather severe attack of "la grippe," as it were, and though it is yet only convalescent, the signs of perfect recovery presage a more healthy condition of that complex system of human interests called "trade and commerce" than it has experienced for more than a year.

A great cry has been raised in certain financial circles about anticipated stagnation in business, owing to the recent outflow of gold. I don't apprehend any trouble from this cause, nor any unusual depression. Referring to the Treasury Department's refusal to part with gold bars, it has been argued by some of the prophets of business evil that this action on the part of the treasury would be unfavorably regarded in London. I fail, however, to see it in that light. The effect over there should be the very reverse, as the action of the treasury implies the highest compliment, that of imitation, to the Bank of England, this being simply a precedent long since established by that institution.

The principle of sending coin in preference to gold bars has been for some time adopted by the Bank of France also, and it has been found to work advantageously for both, the chief reason being that the coin suffers in value from the attrition. This loss, however, I have reason to believe, has been greatly exaggerated. Europe must have gold at present, and it seems that this country is now the only available source of supply.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are abundantly able to send gold to accommodate them on the other side. It will have a favorable effect on the situation in Europe, which will again react favorably upon us, and when we want the gold back, it will in all probability be ready for us. So we have very little to fear from this source in the way of material disturbance to the progress of business.

It is not unusual to make shipments of gold at this time of the year when Europe has been supplied with almost all the other products that we can send her.

The occasional return of a limited amount of American securities, also, will necessitate exports of more gold during the spring, but there is no prospect of such an outflow as will be calculated to clog the wheels of business prosperity. On the contrary, it will be more likely to aid us through the law of reciprocity and the mutual recognition of benefits received.

The financial world has risen to a great extent above the depressing effect of the threatened collapses of many banks and firms growing out of injudicious investments and speculations in the Argentine Republic, and there are prospects within the last few days of that enterprising country being financially wound up so that it will cease to be a disturbing element in the great financial centre of England, which, prior to last fall, seemed to exercise a controlling power over the progress of business throughout the world.

There are many indications that the power which that great centre formerly wielded is being transferred to New York, which has been a worthy candidate for it, the plutocracy of the Rothschilds notwithstanding.

It is worth while, I think, to glance at this highly probable feature of the financial situation, as it would be one of the most powerful factors in imparting that degree of stability to business which would insure almost unvarying progress on this side at least, and render the periodical occurrence of panics less likely in the future. New York is in every respect fitted to become the great financial centre of the world. It is here that the star of financial empire is likely to become a fixed star. If the contemplated "merging, consolidating, and incorporating" of the able commission now at work on this interesting problem is a success, this city will soon have nearly three millions of inhabitants, and take rank as the second city in the world in population, and perhaps in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wealth. Another decade or two will make it a close rival of London, at least in population, with elements of progress that will enable it to outstrip that gigantic growth of centuries, probably before the close of our bi-centennial.

With the reciprocity idea in commerce of the present government intelligently carried out, our spacious harbor affords us an opportunity for the creation of the greatest merchant marine in the world, in comparison with which the argosies of Tyre and Sidon and the mammoth fleet of England would assume moderate dimensions.

I am attempting to regard New York now not only as a centre of business, but as a regulator of those financial conditions upon which the steady progress of business throughout the country depends; and for this purpose it is necessary to compare the relative importance of our metropolis with the great financial centres of Europe, as their interdependence is becoming more and more emphasized every day, especially in a season of threatened panic to any one of them.

There is material for a book on this subject alone. If we are strong enough at present to accommodate and relieve the great capitals of the whole world when their financial machinery is out of gear, what a power we should be in the financial world under the development contemplated through consolidation, and a merchant marine that would enable us to compete for a fair share of the hundreds of millions of commerce monopolized by a few European nations!

I know there are profound thinkers who are convinced that a marine of any kind, either military or merchant, would only be a source of weakness, but I am unable to take this economic view of the subject, either as a patriot or as a financier. Those who take this opposite view argue very cogently: "If you have a merchant marine, you must have a naval power to defend and protect it." Very well, I say, let us have both if necessary. They will eventually be good-paying investments, merely from a business standpoint, and impart vigor and additional healthy action to business; and they may, moreover, be indispensable so long as the millennium is postponed. Even the empty threat of Italy recently illustrated how the want of a naval power can cast a serious damper on the progress of business. In view, therefore, of a repetition of this kind of trouble, I would suggest *en passant* that, if foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations propose to hold the United States government responsible for all their subjects that come to this country as an asylum and to better their condition, then we must see to it that hereafter none are permitted to land on our shores excepting they bring with them proper credentials and a full record of their past lives. In such an event we can draw the line between reputable immigrants, that will not get us into trouble, as against brigands, cutthroats, highway robbers, and sneak-thieves, who are sure to do so.

The solemn warning of the late Hon. Samuel J. Tilden, in a letter to the Hon. J. G. Carlisle, and the startling calculation therein set forth in reference to our coast defences, are entitled to due consideration, irrespective of party politics. The Sage of Greystone wrote: "The value of the property in our seaboard cities exceeds $5,000,000,000. A conflict with any of the great naval powers would lead to its destruction. To neglect the adoption of precautions for the national safety is to invite assault and heavy sacrifice."

This calculation shows that even the liberal appropriations of a "billion-dollar" Congress sink into moderate dimensions compared with the financial loss that might be entailed by an invasion of our seaboard cities and towns, to say nothing of the disastrous consequences to business, and making no allowance, from the business stand-point, except what may affect it, for the loss of honor and destruction of life. So, I say, on economical grounds alone, let us have two marine fleets, or more if necessary. They will be a good investment, even at the generous estimates of the late Congress, and will redound to the honor and glory of the nation, as well as of its business prosperity and permanent material interests.

But to return to the more immediate causes bearing upon the prospects of business in the near future, the following may be accepted, I think, as a maxim, so far as the money situation is concerned: The European money-centres, such as London, Paris, Frankfort, and Berlin, cannot fail to recognize the fact that New York is at present the strongest financial point in the world, and, whatever financial troubles are in store for Europe, their influence upon us can only be temporary and not very deep-seated. This may seem to be a high position to take, but the history of the late financial troubles, I think, will show that it is the true one. The only specially weak spot on this side at present is the short corn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crop of last year. There is every indication of a good crop this year; therefore last year's deficiency will soon be a matter of history that will shortly cease to have any unfavorable influence. If the favorable crop indications in general now prevailing continue a short time longer, the good effect upon business of every description will become so apparent as to attract universal recognition, and Wall Street will feel the beneficent result more impressively than any other sphere of business activity.

Silver is now on a satisfactory commercial basis, and one of our articles of export. The failure of the late Congress to pass the free-coinage bill has retained all securities on a gold basis, and averted the risk of those wide fluctuations in prices which constitute one of the most fertile causes of failures in business, and consequent panics.

The Baring failure did not affect us very unfavorably except in a few isolated instances, for the reason that we were in an unusually good position to take back all our own good marketable securities that were offered, and, though the effort may have pinched many for the time being, it will ultimately confer a great benefit on those who had the courage and the confidence to invest, as they obtained the securities at low prices, and the latter have since appreciated in value, and will probably go still higher. London was thus relieved of the greater portion of American securities in speculative hands, and both parties were financially benefited, the English being lightened of their extra load in a season of money stringency, and the Americans getting back valuable securities upon which fair, and in some instances handsome, profits were to be realized. The larger portion of American securities remaining in British hands are investments either for a lifetime or very large profits. Another class of investments made by enterprising Englishmen, which has accrued to the benefit of this country, was that of industrials, including a large number of American breweries. Although many of them have not realized expectation, some of them have been put on a good paying basis. They were the means of bringing a large amount of British money or its equivalent into this country, variously estimated from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000, thus enabling us the more easily to pay the Britishers for our returned securities in their own coin during the panic. This was a great help in sustaining the financial equipoise when the Baring bombshell burst so unexpectedly, in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

season of comparative prosperity. The money received from these industries was one of the protective factors that enabled us to resist the shock of the London explosion and to recuperate so quickly afterwards.

One of the things that have contributed in a large degree to make London the great money centre of the world has been the power of the few great banking-houses of that metropolis, such as the Baring Brothers and others that might be named, with connections all over the world, to afford facilities through mercantile credits for an interchange of commodities, London being the clearing-house for the world's transactions. Prominently at the head of these great financial concerns was the house of Baring Brothers for more than a century. The prestige of the Barings is gone, and the house has lost that universal confidence which was the mainstay of its greatness. It was considered impregnable, but it is hardly possible that it will soon be able to inspire that feeling again. The prestige of London as a reliable money-centre, to some extent, went with the fall of the Barings. Where, then, can the financial world look for a substitute? Hardly to the French capital, owing to the unsavory memory of the copper syndicate, the Panama Canal fiasco, and other collapses of a kindred nature. Frankfort and Berlin are not big enough, though backed by the powerful treasury of the Rothschilds. Manifest destiny would then seem to point to New York as the great future clearing-house of the world.

There is another geographical fact connected with New York, besides its spacious harbor, which makes it both conspicuous and powerful as a commercial and business centre. About one-fourth of the population of the United States cluster within a radius of 200 miles of the city, a large portion of those being engaged in mercantile pursuits. So a very considerable part of the business people of the country are within a smaller compass than the ordinary observer might imagine by taking a view of our extensive domain and comparing the entire population of 65,000,000 therewith. This fact has the advantage of imparting greater impetus to business activity at this point than if this important fraction of the population were more evenly distributed, and it is therefore entitled to careful recognition in the appreciation of New York as a financial and business centre. This is one of the circumstances which enables New York to act as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial regulator and distributer with greater facility than any other city in the country. To sum up the chief reasons, then, for confident expectations of brighter business prospects during the remainder of the year, it may be safely presumed that the basis of this belief is the assurance of plethoric money throughout the summer; next, the evident prospect of good crops, while the European crops are a partial failure; third, the defeat of Western legislators in their attempts to pass unwise and unconstitutional laws against the railroads and the best interests of their own States; and, fourth, the issue of $5,000,000 legal tenders every month by the government, which is equal to $60,000,000 a year of new money thrown into the active circulation, in addition to the increase arising from our native production of gold.

While the creation of money is going on, the manufacture of securities such as are acceptable to the New York Stock Exchange has almost ceased. Hence the good properties now dealt in at that great mart are entitled to a substantial advance, and the present rising wave in the market strongly indicates that tendency.

The concurrence of the conditions here briefly sketched, I think, is calculated to develop a more confident and universal feeling with reference to the favorable future of business, and there is undoubtedly a sound basis for appreciation in the values of solid securities, the majority of which are now below the average of their intrinsic value.

The country at large has seldom or never been in a more prosperous condition, prospectively considered, and its foreign relations from a business point of view are almost as satisfactory as could be desired.

The bill passed by the House at Albany to reduce the legal rate of interest in this State to 5 per cent. is regarded as a very important measure in financial circles, and it is to be hoped that it will not pass the Senate. Its tendency would be to drive away capital from this city and State, and to considerably diminish the supply of funds required to relieve occasional stringencies in the outside districts. The pernicious influence of the bill would therefore extend far beyond the limits of this State, and would exercise a depressive effect on business wherever borrowers from capitalists in this city and State might reside.

HENRY CLEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LYNCH LAW AND UNRESTRICTED IMMIGRATION.

BY THE HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

ON Sunday, March 15, the people of the United States were startled and shocked by hearing that on the preceding day a mob in New Orleans, led by men of good standing in the community, had broken into one of the prisons and with cool deliberation had killed eleven Italians who were confined there. The victims of this attack were accused of complicity in the recent murder of the chief of police. Two had never been brought to trial, and the trial of the others had resulted in the acquittal of six and a mistrial as to three. The mob acted on the belief that these men were guilty of the crime with which they were charged; that that crime was the work of a secret society known as the Mafia; and that the failure of the jury to convict was due either to terror of this secret organization or to bribery by its agents.

Americans are a law-abiding people, and an act of lawlessness like the lynching of these Italians is sure to meet with their utmost disapproval. There is no doubt that every intelligent man deplores the lawless act of the New Orleans mob. But to stop there would be the reverse of intelligent. To visit on the heads of the mob all our reprobation, and to find in its act alone matter of anxiety and regret, would not only be unjust, but would show a very slight apprehension of the gravity and meaning of this event. Such acts as the killing of these eleven Italians do not spring from nothing without reason or provocation. The mob would have been impossible if there had not been a large body of public opinion behind it, and if it had not been recognized that it was not mere riot, but rather that revenge which Lord Bacon says is a kind of wild justice. The mob was deplorable, but the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public sentiment which created it was more deplorable still, and deserves to have the reasons for its existence gravely and carefully considered.

What, then, are the true causes of the events of the 14th of March at New Orleans? One, certainly, was the general belief that there had been a gross miscarriage of justice in the trial of the accused Italians. Whether the jury rendered their verdict against the evidence or not, it is certain that the people of New Orleans pretty generally thought that they had done so. It is, unfortunately, only too evident that there is a profound lack of confidence in the juries of New Orleans. Lawlessness and lynching are evil things, but a popular belief that juries cannot be trusted is even worse, for it is an indication that the law is breaking down in its ordinary operations. This condition of public opinion is, no doubt, due in very large measure to the extremely bad condition of politics in New Orleans; a fact of which the country has had for some time a vague idea, but upon which, since the 14th of March, it has received a great deal of very definite information. A city in which political meetings concerned only with the affairs of a single party are held under the conditions which attended the caucuses at the time of the struggle between Governors Nicholls and McEnery, and where a great gambling enterprise has been sowing the seeds of corruption in every direction, is in a very bad way. Violence breeds violence, and corruption engenders corruption. Wrong-doing of this sort always returns to plague the inventors. At the same time, the condition of municipal politics in New Orleans is something that the people of that city must deal with themselves. If they do not set matters right in this respect, no one else can, and they will suffer by their bad city politics more than anybody else.

The other exciting cause of the mob was the belief that the men who were killed were members of the Mafia, a secret society bound by the most rigid oaths and using murder as a means of maintaining its discipline and carrying out its decrees. Of the existence of such a society no reasonable man can, I think, have any doubt. That it has, as a rule, confined its operations to the people who brought it here is, I think, equally beyond question. But there is nothing to keep it necessarily within such bounds. It is anything but self-limited, and in a political soil like that of New Orleans it was pretty sure to extend. Now,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if there is one thing more hateful to Americans than another, it is secret, oath-bound societies which employ assassination as a recognized means for carrying out their objects. The killing of the eleven prisoners had in it no race feeling whatever. There has been no hostility to the Italians in America, as such. On the contrary, they have been generally regarded hitherto as an industrious people, prone to fierce quarrels among themselves, but, in the main, thrifty, hardworking, and well behaved. The men were not killed in the New Orleans prison because they were Italians, but because they were believed to be members of a secret-assassination society responsible for a brutal murder. There was a further popular belief that this society was not only responsible for the murder of the chief of police, but that it was extending its operations that it was controlling juries by terror, and that it would gradually bring the government of the city and the State under its control. This belief, no doubt, was exaggerated, but it was certainly not without foundation.

We have, therefore, three facts here of the gravest import. First, an outbreak of lawlessness which resulted in the death of eleven men; second, a belief that juries could not be depended upon to administer justice and protect the lives of the citizens; third, the existence of a secret society which was ready to use both money and murder to accomplish its objects, even to the point of perverting the administration of the law. It is my purpose to deal only with the last phase of this question. I believe that, whatever the proximate causes of the shocking event at New Orleans may have been, the underlying cause, and the one with which alone the people of the United States can deal, is to be found in the utter carelessness with which we treat immigration to this country.

The killing of the prisoners at New Orleans was due chiefly to the fact that they were supposed to be members of the Mafia, but it would be a great mistake to suppose that the Mafia stands alone. Societies or political organizations which regard assassination as legitimate have been the product of repressive government on the continent of Europe. They are the offspring of conditions and of ideas wholly alien to the people of the United States. Nevertheless, to certain minds they present a permanent attraction, and there are classes of men sufficiently illiterate and sufficiently criminal to reproduce them wherever they may happen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be, even when there is no repressive government to serve as an excuse. The last twenty years have shown the existence of these societies at various times in one form or another in the United States. They have appeared in different parts of the country, and have usually been put down and their deeds punished by ordinary process of law. We have had, for example, the Molly Maguires in Pennsylvania, the Anarchists in Chicago, the Mafia in New Orleans, and, according to a recent statement in the New York *Times*, there is a similar organization among some of the Poles.* It is idle to say that, like all other honest citizens, the great mass of men belonging to the races which have been most pointedly connected with these organizations heartily disapprove them. There is no question that this is true; and yet none the less these dangerous societies spring up and commit murders, and are either put down by the law or crushed out by wild deeds of lawlessness and bloodshed like that at New Orleans. They come not from race peculiarities, but from the quality of certain classes of immigrants of all races. If we permit the classes which furnish material for these societies to come freely to this country, we shall have these outrages to deal with, and such scenes as that of the 14th of March will be repeated.

In the January number of this REVIEW I brought together some statistics in regard to immigration and the changes in its character, as shown by the official reports of the last few years. Since the appearance of that article a special report by Mr. F. L. Dingley upon the subject of European immigration has been issued by the State Department, and some of the statements which he makes are well worth consideration. They have an especial

* A dispatch to the New York *Times* dated Shenandoah, February 10, and headed "Secret Polish Avengers," says: "It is now well known that a secret Polish society, organized for the purpose of defending their people and avenging their wrongs, has existed in this valley for the past two years. The police officers of this place have made the discovery, which in details is as sensational as anything connected with the Molly Maguire troubles." Then follows an account of a disturbance in a Polish saloon in which one Balsekavage was beaten and robbed by John Anskitis. After the arrest of the latter seven of his friends started out to avenge him, and made a murderous assault upon a party of Balsekavage's friends, but were attacked by the police and arrested. "The society to which these men belong consists of about forty members. They have no place of meeting, but congregate in gangs on the street corners and in saloons. If one of the members gets into trouble, whether he is right or wrong the society is obliged to stand by him and get him out of it at any cost. The police state that one of the most important objects of the society is subornation of perjury, and the rules of the society appear to have been most boldly enforced of late."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weight, because Mr. Dingley takes a very rosy view of the immigration to this country and is decidedly friendly to it, although he is not blind to its evils, and advises that precautions should be taken to sift and direct it. In the previous article to which I have just referred I made the point that the immigration of those races which had thus far built up the United States, and which are related to each other either by blood or language or both, was declining, while the immigration of races totally alien to them was increasing. Mr. Dingley's very recent facts strengthen this conclusion, and I desire to call attention to some of the evidence his report furnishes.

The French, Belgian, and Dutch immigration, all of which has proved valuable to this country, is, as it has always been, so small as to be of comparatively slight importance. The German immigration, which has been not only one of the largest, but one of the best, has continued to decline. In the first five months of 1890 it fell off 6,000 as compared with the corresponding months of 1889. Of the Scandinavian immigration Mr. Dingley says: "The emigration from Sweden to the United States for several years averaged from forty to fifty thousand annually, but it is now slowly receding." From Great Britain and Ireland the figures are even more suggestive.

"For the eight months of 1890 ending August 31, as compared with the corresponding months of 1889, there was a decline of 7,426 in the total number of English emigrants to the United States; in Scotch emigrants, a decline of 3,348, and a decline of 6,321 in Irish emigration. The total decline of emigrants of British origin in this period, as compared with the corresponding period of 1889, was 17,195; the total for this period of eight months in 1890 was 106,123."

On the other hand, the immigration of Poles, Bohemians, Hungarians, Russians, and Italians is increasing. Here is a description which Mr. Dingley gives of some of them:

"Says one of the observers of the emigrant movement to the writer:

"'There are forty young fellows in that group yonder whom I saw returning from the United States last fall. They are now about returning together to the United States. I cannot prove that they are contract laborers, but I believe they are. They form an illustration of a good many emigrants. They have a leader; if the boarding-house gets that leader, he gets the whole party—they follow him as the sheep follow their leader. These parties formerly went to Holland to make brick by contract; now they do better by going to the United States. Do you see that woman who goes along with them with that huge pack on her back? She does the drudgery for the workmen, cooks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for them, and carries their rags. Every group of ten of these contract workers has an old woman to do their cooking.

"'Who are they? They are generally Poles, generally young, generally ignorant. They are warranted work in the States at better wages than they used to get in Holland. They scrape together considerable money in the States and return to Poland each autumn to stay until they are again wanted in the ensuing spring in the United States. They travel from Poland to Bremen in fourth-class cars, like cattle and at live-stock rates. They can get rich on low wages, live on pork and stale bread, and are killing competitors of unskilled American labor.'

"Perhaps the most pitiable lot in the emigrant groups which I am describing is a party of Russian Jews, starved out of Russia, going to the United States to join the congested ranks of middlemen. They are almost revolting, mainly pedlers of the smallest scale. Nobody wants them, even in the poorest emigrant lodging-houses. The more one observes this movement the more he is inclined to say that the place to stop it is not at Castle Garden, but in Russia.

"I learn that in England students of this subject are now urging that the question be made a subject of diplomatic attention, for England is suffering from pauper immigration more notably according to its population than ourselves.

"A comparison of the personnel of the various natural [national?—ED.] groups in Bremen emigrant lodging-houses shows at a glance the superiority of the Germans and Scandinavians. These Germans have an average of $50 in their pockets, besides their tickets to the American destination, some of them as far as Missouri and Dakota, but the Jews and Poles are practically penniless.'

Worse than all, perhaps, is the movement of low-class labor from the far East. On this point Mr. Dingley says:

Perhaps the most discouraging feature of the statistics from Marseilles is the decided increase in the oriental movement—Syrians and Armenians.'

The same increase holds true of Italy as of Hungary, Russia, and Poland.

"The total emigration from Naples to the United States in 1889 was 15,709. In the first three months of 1890 the total emigration was ten times larger than for the corresponding period of 1889. From Naples, during the first three months of 1890, there emigrated to the United States 12,633 Italians and Sicilians. The movement from Sicily has been rapidly increasing during the past few years. From Palermo, in 1887, 2,201 Sicilians embarked, destined for the United States; in 1888 the number advanced to 3,713, while in 1889 it moved up to 6,017; while during the present year the number is likely to be as great or larger.

"The American consul at Palermo, speaking of Sicilian emigrants, says: 'The Sicilian emigrants to the United States are generally rustic and of the lowest type of the Italian as to character and intelligence, few, if any, being able to read or write. They have not, as a rule, a cent of money after paying their fare.'"

These are some of the figures, and Mr. Dingley further states

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that 85 per cent. of the Italian immigration is from Sicily and southern Italy. These facts which I have quoted from Mr. Dingley's report all show the truth of what I said in my previous article—that not only was our immigration changing in point of race, but that it was deteriorating.*

There is also another side to the Italian immigration pointed out by Mr. Dingley which deserves a passing notice. This is the large number of Italians who stay but a short time in the United States, and who then return to their native country with such money as they have been able to save here. I quote the report again :

"What amazes is the size of the countercurrent. Sometimes as many as 1,000 Italians came back from the United States to Naples in the month of December. . . . Hence, when they have made a few dollars in the United States beyond the present wants, they hasten to their old homes. They love to spend their savings in Italy ; it seems to them almost a sacrilege to spend them elsewhere."

This, of course, is a most unwholesome feature in any immigration. Persons who come to the United States, reduce the rate of wages by ruinous competition, and then take their savings out of the country, are not desirable. They are mere birds of passage. They form an element in the population which regards as home a foreign country, instead of that in which they

* The latest statistics from the last treasury statement are as follows :

	Month ending January 31.		Seven months ending January 31.	
COUNTRIES.	1891.	1890.	1891.	1890.
Austria-Hungary:				
Bohemia	197	50	4,693	1,268
Hungary	1,299	767	13,695	10,228
Other Austria (except Poland)	1,034	1,302	14,106	13,670
Total	2,530	2,119	32,494	25,166
Denmark	173	127	3,874	3,217
France	241	3 5	4,065	4,029
Germany	2,685	2,236	50,261	45,739
Great Britain and Ireland :				
England and Wales	1,548	1,590	31,125	32,700
Scotland	468	317	5,776	6,317
Ireland	543	550	21,116	20,734
Total	2,499	2,457	58,017	59,751
Italy	1,766	1,627	27,282	16,440
Netherlands	78	107	1,510	1,451
Poland	1,252	294	12,321	2,699
Russia (except Poland)	2,017	1,121	22,951	16,746
Sweden and Norway	405	258	18,678	16,229
Switzerland	186	163	3,250	3,428
All other countries	955	484	10,273	6,785
Total	14,287	11,298	244,976	201,680

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

live and earn money. They have no interest or stake in the country, and they never become American citizens.

More serious, however, than these statements as to the general character of the present immigration are, perhaps, the startling facts which Mr. Dingley brings to light as to the utter failure of any laws or regulations which we now have to exclude members of the criminal classes. I will give a few extracts to show how serious this objection is. He says on this point in regard to Germany, whence comes so much of our best immigration:

"One sees some pardoned criminals. A lawyer who was sentenced to imprisonment for swindling was pardoned and sailed hence for the United States to start anew. Such persons are advised to leave their country for the joint good of country and self.

"An American resident in Bremen states:

"'I know of one case where two ex-convicts were assisted to leave Germany for the United States by a benevolent society. There are in every large German city societies to help ex-criminals to get a new start in the world. The United States consul at Bremen detected one case where two convicts had a new outfit and tickets for New York furnished by a benevolent society. These men were returned to Germany, but probably they have since gone to New York by some other line. They are birds of prey; you may see them in new suits and new outfits, handbag, etc., and generally they are tramps or ex-criminals who are being helped out of Europe, not by the government, but by so-called benevolent societies, whose object in part, I fear, is to get rid of undesirable population more than to bless all mankind. . . .'

"A German-American in Hamburg speaks as follows:

"'Many criminals and socialists have gone to the United States from Germany in recent years, because they are not so thoroughly hounded there, while the American laws are less impertinent than the German.'"

The same is true of the Scandinavian immigration, which has also been one of our best sources of immigration.

"Although such things are difficult to substantiate, still, from my own observation and from circumstances I have heard related and occasional incidental accounts in the press, I am thoroughly satisfied that criminals, vicious characters, paupers, and other objectionable persons have been and are constantly being assisted to America for the purpose of getting rid of them; and I doubt very much if there is a single hamlet, village, or any other community, not to speak of the large cities, in the whole kingdom which could not furnish instances of such a practice.

"I believe this is principally done by private subscription by members of the community to rid themselves of objectionable characters; but I also am perfectly confident that it is done as well by the officials of prisons, poorhouses, and other institutions, for the reason that, careful as the press is about publishing anything reflecting unfavorably upon their country or institutions, occasional instances inadvertently, or in other connections, appear in print."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The worst showing is made at Liverpool, as might be expected from the very large number of immigrants leaving that port. Mr. Dingley quotes on this point the statement of an emigrant agent:

"I think that at least one hundred very objectionable emigrants leave Liverpool every week for New York. Some of these, and perhaps the most objectionable, are British paupers assisted by benevolent societies; some of them are ex-convicts, but the most of them are paupers from the Continent—I mean persons without a cent of money or an outlook or trade or habits of industry or of self-support. There is an agent in Liverpool who takes ex-convicts, sees them on the ship, and pays them their 'good-behavior money,' after paying their passage to the United States. They are furnished with a new suit of clothes, and are given to understand that they can do better abroad than at home. They have something over and above their tickets. The government is not concerned in this matter, but they get to America on British funds."

The Mormon immigration is declining, and yet Mr. Dingley found 120 on a single ship, and was told by one of their missionaries that they brought over 700 a year. If these are the facts in regard to our best sources of immigration, we can imagine what they must be in regard to the worst. In the excitement growing out of the affair at New Orleans one Italian newspaper said there were galley-slaves at every point on the Atlantic coast, and there can be little doubt that there were ex-convicts among the New Orleans Mafia.

It would require more space than THE REVIEW could give if I were to quote what is said in this report on the subject of disease among immigrants, but it has the same bearing as the statements in regard to the immigration of convicts and criminals. Ports in Europe where we used to have a consular medical examination are now entirely unguarded, and even at places where cholera has appeared nothing is done by the United States to prevent the shipment of persons from infected districts.

The increase of paupers is more alarming than that of criminals and diseased persons. Most of the Italians, Poles, and Hungarians have no money at all. They land in this country without a cent in their pockets. The condition of the Russian Jews seen by Mr. Dingley is even worse. Yet it has been stated in the newspapers that plans are on foot to remove these unfortunate people from Russia to the number of four millions and land them in the United States.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to make any comment upon the extracts which I have quoted from Mr. Dingley's very interesting report; but if we reflect that on his own statement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one-half the pauper population of Massachusetts and New York is of foreign birth, I think we can see how deeply alarming the present condition of affairs is.

The last Congress passed an act to regulate immigration. It aims at nothing more than an attempt by better organization to enforce existing laws, which are not carried out now with any efficiency. It is well to have this done, of course, on the principle that something is better than nothing, but the act falls far short of what is needed. Here in this report we have the statement of an expert, who has made a most careful investigation, that the immigration of the races who have peopled the United States, and among whom the standard of education and character is comparatively high, is falling off, and that the immigration of people removed from us in race and blood is rapidly increasing, and that these people are almost wholly illiterate and for the most part without resources, either in skill, training, or money. We also learn that many of them come here merely for a temporary purpose, and that by one channel or another the paupers and criminals of Europe, covertly assisted in many instances by government or by benevolent societies, are pouring into the United States. It is not to be wondered at that from such elements secret societies, with assassination among their tenets, spring up, and that such bloody work as that of New Orleans or the slaughter of the policemen in the Chicago Haymarket ensues.

Surely the time has come for an intelligent and effective restriction of immigration. No one wishes to exclude a desirable immigrant who seeks in good faith to become a citizen of the United States ; but it certainly is madness to permit this stream to pour in without discrimination or selection, or the exclusion of dangerous and undesirable elements. There are great States in the West and Southwest naturally anxious to have their lands occupied and their population increased, but there is something more important than rapidity of settlement or the quick development of wealth. These advantages will be dearly bought if we pay for them a price which involves the lowering of the standard of American citizenship. More important to a country than wealth and population is the quality of its people. Far more valuable than sudden wealth is the maintenance of good wages among American workingmen and the exclusion of an unlimited supply of low-class labor with which they cannot compete.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the present state of things, not only are we doing nothing to protect the quality of our citizenship or the wages of our workingmen from an unrestricted flood of immigration, but we are permitting persons so ignorant and criminal to come among us that organizations like the Mafia are sure to rise in our midst. The time has come for an intelligent restriction. Mr. Dingley advises—what every person who has looked carefully into the subject suggests—consular inspection in the country of departure. To this, I think, should be added some such fair and restrictive test as that of ability to read and write. What is needed now most of all, however, is an intelligent and active public opinion to which Congress will respond. If we do not act, and act intelligently, we must be prepared for just such events as that at New Orleans, not merely bringing in their train murder and sudden death, but breeding race antagonisms and national hostilities which never existed before, and which need never have an existence if we deal properly with this momentous problem.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POLITICIAN AND THE PHARISEE.

BY THE HON. J. S. CLARKSON, LATE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

THE United States government is first a political and second a business organization. If it is purely an affair of business, it could not be noble enough in the larger things in human ambition and existence to protect life, insure liberty, and promote human happiness. It is something which, under the blessing of God and the wisdom of man, comprehends and serves first greater aspirations than any mere sordid thing of business, finance, or commerce. Therefore it is not primarily a business machine. It is something with a soul, and that soul, let the reformers cant as they may, is put into it through politics.

For this is a representative government based on party responsibility. The people at the polls, deciding between certain parties, decide in favor of certain political or party principles. When they elect a Republican candidate for President, they indorse the Republican platform of principles, and expect to see those principles carried out in the government during the term of that President. When they elect a Democratic candidate for President, they expect to see the Democratic principles carried out in the government during his term. This was the intention of the fathers of the republic and the makers of the constitution, and this idea controlled, and party principles ruled in government, under the limitations of reason and law, for the first hundred years of the republic, to the satisfaction of the people and the vindication before the world of the capacity of man for self-government.

In these first hundred years partyism was encouraged and applauded; not discouraged and flouted according to the new intellectual fashion of this latter day. Indeed, the early men of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the republic felt and taught that honorable party zeal was an active and practical form of public patriotism. In truth, the larger fear of the fathers in establishing a republic was that the indifference of the average voter might imperil and prevent the actual rule of the people. For a hundred years American boys were taught love of country, pride of party, and promotion and protection of liberty through patriotism of party. The man who took constant interest in public affairs, who sought by constant industry to make his government better, locally or nationally, who worked with unselfishness and generosity for his country by working for his party, who had such pride in party record that he vigilantly employed every honorable endeavor to keep it pure and honest, was called in those better days the better citizen.

The people saw clearly then that their only way to exert influence in government was to identify themselves with party. If they believed in certain principles, they allied themselves with all others who believed in the same principles, and this assembling of people of kindred belief and aspiration formed a political party. The first impulse toward it was one of patriotism. The constant incentive in it was love of country. So the first Americans found political parties necessary, and both from honor and from party interest saw that they must be kept pure in order to gain the approval and retain the confidence of the people. It was this spirit and this pride of party which made the first hundred years of the government in business record, as well as in record for liberty and human rights, unequalled in the world, whether a comparison be made with other governments, as to the faithful transaction of business and the minimum of loss in the collection and disbursement of revenues, or with the most perfect and scrupulous methods and systems of the business or commercial world.

In that good old fashioned time of simple faith and open belief, when any political party assumed power in the government, whether of city, State, or nation, it assumed full responsibility. That which was good in its administration of the government went to its credit; that which was bad went to its discredit. The people did not ask, after they had given it full power, whether it would choose faithful and friendly agents to serve under it. They took it for granted that in human wisdom it would follow the lesson of human experience that a friend is safer than an enemy. It was never believed, in the first hundred years of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America, that any national administration could carry on the government better with people who did not believe in its principles than with people who did. Otherwise, in those days it was not believed that Democrats could carry out Republican principles in the government better than Republicans. The plain people of that period had never read in the Bible, nor in human history, that an enemy is more dependable or more serviceable, either in public or private life, than a friend. The people always knew, when they elected the Democratic party, that they had indorsed Democratic principles. They knew they were to have a Democratic administration; and let it be said that the Democratic party has never disappointed this expectation up to date.

The Pharisee, who made his appearance in American politics at the same time that the Democratic party—the smartest thing in human guile which this young country has ever known—purchased several Republican newspapers and set them to teaching the Democratic doctrines while still bearing the Republican name, proclaimed that the first hundred years of the republic had been all wrong. Under the American fashion the elder men had sought the interest of the younger men in public affairs. Frequent changes in public office were also advocated. All told, in nation, State, county, district, city, and precinct nearly a million of offices were created. It was taught that it was not only the privilege, but the duty, of every intelligent and patriotic citizen to engage in politics, and to hold office when his fellow-citizens demanded it. Under this theory every active and earnest citizen of the republic, especially in the rural communities, was almost sure at some time to hold some office and be educated in government, and to learn the conservatism of government. It was also cherished as one of the glories of the republic that the humblest family in the land might furnish the best public officer. The Pharisee came to reverse all this. He came to teach that partyism, or love of party, or activity in politics, was a peril to the republic; that constant political agitation was hurtful to the nation; that the political caucus in the township, otherwise the town meeting, was a menace to the republic; and that activity and politics made a man dangerous in government. So the argument goes on to-day.

For my own part, I believe in the old theory. I believe in the politician—otherwise, in the American who takes an active

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personal interest in public affairs, beginning with the smallest office and continuing through to the largest—rather than in the Pharisee, who would introduce into the republic the doctrine that private or individual interest in government is wrong, that officeholding does not concern the people, and that life tenure in office is both wise and necessary. I believe, too, that every good American citizen is a politician. It is a good word, although the Pharisee would make it an epithet. He scouts the word politician and uses the word statesman. Our accepted dictionaries make little difference between politician and statesman. In the sense that any one who takes an interest in politics is a politician, as he is, we have millions of politicians in America. In the sense that a man, to be a statesman in any country, must be known in the whole world of statesmen, we have very few.

As the town meeting, the initial movement in our government, is the unit of public welfare, so may it be that the politician of the town meeting may be not only the best citizen of his own community, but the most useful citizen of his State. For the town meeting is not only the basis of liberty in American government, but without it liberty would soon go. It is the absence of the town meeting in the South which is responsible for the absence of both home rule and liberty in that portion of the country. If the South had the town meeting, as the North has it,—otherwise, if its thousands of precincts or small communities had the right to rule in their own affairs,—what is called the Southern question now in politics would be speedily settled. For if the hundreds of thousands of free men in the South among the white men there, as well as the millions of free men among the black people, could make a start in politics, if they could make this precinct Republican, or this county Republican, or that district Republican, each according to its honest majority, the leaven would soon spread, and the South be put in line with its own true interests, and no longer left an oligarchy, governed by centralized tyrannies at the various State capitals. The coercion and disfranchisement of the black men of the South are the cruelty of this age. Yet nearly as alarming is the coercion of hundreds of thousands of Southern white men who do not believe in the bourbonism of Democratic rule or in the cruelty of Democratic methods, but who are terrorized into stifling their own consciences, suppressing their own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles, and acting with the party in whose doctrine and destiny they do not believe.

I am not of those who think that millions of Americans may be politically smothered. There is a palsy of political parties just now ; but God can cure this palsy, as he can the other plagues that fall upon men. It is an axiom of the ages that unsettled questions have no pity for the repose of nations ; and any soothsayer of this timid time who thinks that six millions of colored people in the South, twice as many as composed the people of the colonies at the time of the Revolution, can be degraded into a servile peasantry, and a million voters permanently disfranchised, little comprehends the final justice of man or the overwatching justice of God. Time will settle this question. Timorous politicians or lawmakers of to-day may postpone the settlement, as timorous men once before referred the question of slavery from a settlement of statesmanship to one of blood. If the South had the town meeting, and with it its half-dozen politicians, with pride of party and love of liberty, in every town and precinct, it would be settled on Southern soil and by Southern men, and would not clog the way all the time in the national capital.

I believe in the politician, and am not afraid of the word. The American politician who loves his country is the best American. This country will never be in danger from the man who honorably spends his time to see that his party has the best men for candidates and his government the best men for officers. Give this kind of politicians free course, and we shall have less of the danger that comes through rich men buying high offices with money, and then complacently scouting either obligation to party or duty to the people in filling them. Nor is the country in any danger from any citizen who, having seen that nine times in ten rascality in office follows long continuance in office, demands frequent changes in the interest of the public service.

The Pharisee would change all this, would take away from the people this interest and education in politics, would take away from the million Americans holding office every year the education they thus gain in government, and would teach the masses of Americans to be indifferent to public affairs. He would also make a poor citizen of a man in order to make him a good officer. The people themselves have no fear of the politician. He is the man nearest to them. He has to renew his life at every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

caucus and in every convention and at every election. The more publicity in politics the better; the more activity the better. When the white light of publicity is on anything, the danger is gone. A rathole is no longer a rathole after the sun shines into it. Instead of narrowing the number of men who shall hold public office, instead of taking away public affairs from the people, instead of educating the people to be indifferent in political matters, I would renew the custom of the fathers, and teach in the home, even before the caucus is reached, and again in the caucus, and again in the local convention, and again in every convention and election, until the top is reached, that every boy and every citizen should take an interest in the proceedings at every step, and that every family in the land should be informed in regard to it as well. It is on the hearthstones of this country that all great political questions are finally settled.

I defend also the honesty of the politician. I know personally of the generosity of the men of politics. Twenty-five years' participation in active politics has given me a chance to look in the lion's mouth. I can recall to-day, looking back over this long stretch of time, scarcely any men who have made money in politics. I know of no politician who has become rich as a politician. To find those who find fortune and gear in politics, you must go to the corrupt rule of Tammany or some other large city. I believe that it may be asserted as true that ninety-nine men in every hundred spend more money in politics, and in public affairs and for the public good, than they ever gain in politics or from any sort of office-holding or profit-sharing in government. The presence of corruption in politics is greatly overestimated. There are very few men who want to violate the honor of the Republic or dishonor the record of their party. No man who would debauch the American ballot should be respected by his own family. For the purity of the suffrage, the honesty of this government, the preservation of it in power and patriotism to our children, are far more to any and all of us than anything of party success or power or personal ambition could possibly be. Not merely the essayists who write for reform on salary are honest. The great masses of the people are honest. The rivalries of politics, the quarrels of party, the jealousies and enmities of politicians over office, are many and often shocking. But so in this poor world are the rivalries and jealousies and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enmities of the professions, of the business world, and even of the church. We are all poor mortals, and God must have some charity for us all in our mortality and weakness, whether we be politicians, Pharisees, or persevering saints.

It is the cant of the Pharisee to speak of the cruelty and heartlessness of politics and politicians. I have seen the other side of the shield. I have studied human nature in politics for a quarter of a century. The result has been constantly to refresh my faith in mankind, in the good intention of my neighbor, in the honesty of the masses of the people. I have seen more of generosity displayed in politics, more of self-sacrifice, than in anything else. I have seen men display more activity and more generosity to gain office for friends than for themselves. I have seen, too, as so many blooming flowers on the wall between parties, that freemasonry between men of honor and soul in different political parties which leads constantly to the practice of human charity and individual generosity. You may go to the departments in Washington, and you will find there that the world of politics takes care of those who in any sense appeal to its heart. Nearly every distinguished family in America has some representative in those departments. It is one of the customs of men in politics, when they find the descendant of a man who has served his country well and gone his way to another world, leaving his family poor, to care for that descendant; and the politics of the ancestor is never asked, much less discussed.

By what right does the Pharisee sneer at the politician? By what right does the professional moralist sneer at politics? The hundred years or more of American politics and government is disproof of the sneers of both. The business affairs of the people have been conducted more scrupulously and more accurately than the private business of commerce in the same time. There have been fewer defalcations and fewer rascalities in office, in proportion, than in private life. Who are the politicians who have made money and fortune trafficking in the public name or national honor? Of the six thousand seats that have been filled in Congress in the last thirty years, who are the politicians who have proved dishonest? Is it not true that, where one public official has been found unworthy, twenty men in public life have served the government for a third of the return which they could have gained in the business world or the professions?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What was Samuel J. Randall but a politician?—the man who served his country and kept himself poor; refused a gift of fifty thousand dollars from opulent merchants, and died on a bed worth ten dollars. Who has been a more typical politician in the last fifty years than Oliver P. Morton or John A. Logan, each rendering his nation and his people great service, and dying poor and in a mortgaged home? Hannibal Hamlin is another fair and representative type of the politician, and the whole country reveres the American in him to-day, and forgets the Republican and honors the politician. So might we cite hundreds of thousands of others. Who is the boss in politics, or the local or State leader—that great bogy who is now conjured up by the Pharisees and reformers with which to frighten the people? In the small neighborhood he is the man who does for his party what the class-leader does for his church. He keeps its political lamps trimmed and burning. In the district or State he is generally the most generous man, and has the most ambition in party and pride in country, who does a work so good and from a motive so pure that money could not hire it done, nor merely money find a man able to do it. Why should every other organization of human affairs have a leader, and not politics? The church has a leader; every active organization must have a leader: so must politics. Here and there is found a leader who may be unworthy. He is not a boss until he gets to be unworthy, and then the people, acting in their primary capacity, very quickly dispose of his dishonesty and his lordship. No boss can live more than a year in this country, because every leader has to renew his life at the hands of the people at least once every twelve months. To say that political leaders are dishonest, that they keep a long and corrupt reign of power, extending over years, is to say that the people themselves are either too ignorant to know a dishonest leader or too dishonest to demand honest leadership.

I believe also in practical politics. I believe that when Benjamin Harrison was elected President of the United States, on a platform of Republican principles, he was elected to carry out those principles, and was expected to believe that Republicans could carry them out better than Democrats. Whether he desires it or not, the Republican party is held responsible for his every act. Every Democrat that he retains in office he becomes responsible for, and makes the Republican party responsible for. If any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democrat proves a rascal in holding office under a Republican administration, the Republican party, and not the Democratic, becomes responsible for his rascality, and the people will so hold. This is the sense found at the level of common-sense, and the people believe in it. President Harrison, one of the truest of Americans and most progressive of men, has from the first sought to test to the marrow the good that was reported to be in the new reform. He has tried it honestly and not in half ways. What has been the result? While his administration was in its honeymoon, or for the first year and a half, it had the polite attention and courtesy of a neutral time. Everybody wished it well but the Mugwump, who never wishes well to anything Republican. Yet the executive persevered in faithful, patient trial of the new idea. President Harrison is a sincere Republican; as sincere and earnest as any one in the party, past or present. He believes more in the modern theory than many of us do; and he may be right or he may be wrong. Yet the first two years of his administration, with all its missionary spirit of kindness and sacrificing party spirit, has not placated the Pharisee nor made the Mugwump any more tolerant. Over half the federal offices, places, and clerkships under the control of the administration—a hundred thousand or more—are held by Democrats still, and yet no Mugwump paper and no moral essayist ever lets this fact come into the light. Nearly or quite half the places abroad are still filled by Democrats, who are telling the outside world that the Rebellion was right, that the election of Harrison was an accident where it was not gained by fraud, and that the honest people of the United States will come into power again in '93. Democrats have not only been retained in the offices that they held in the beginning, but many Democrats have been appointed or reappointed to place.

Among the earliest and most tolerant and most missionary of President Harrison's acts was the commissioning of ninety-eight Democratic presidential postmasters who had been appointed by Cleveland. Yet the Mugwump paper never has murmured of these facts in the record of the President. The Inter-State-Railway Commission, an agency of vast power, remains Democratic still. The Civil-Service Commission is more unfriendly and more opposed to the Republican party under Harrison than it was under Cleveland. Several others of the stronger national commissions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or official boards remain Democratic in the Republican time. And yet the President is not saved from the constant and unsparing censure of the Mugwump and Democratic press and people by reason of this or anything else in his administration which spares the Democrat or exalts the Mugwump. The experiment of lowering the temperature of the Republican party to get it cold enough for the Mugwump has failed to capture him or strengthen the party. If the present administration has any weakness to fleck its otherwise spotless record, it is that it has not had enough of politics or politicians in it, nor enough of that cordial, infectious, inspiring party fellowship, contributing to party self-respect and party pride, always so necessary to keep any political organization alive and self-respecting.

The politicians of the Republican name are those who believe in their party, who love its principles, and work always for its glory and success; and there are six millions of them — a strong and splendid army, capable of anything which is good, if rightly led. They do not like the Mugwump or his fads. They have seen that a man in becoming a Mugwump first becomes better than his party, and next better than his country. The average Republicans are content to be as good as their party, and to try to be as good as their country. They would always stand in the open in politics—frank, fearless, candid, positive, and plain. They would choose Republicans to carry out Republican principles. They too would have a rigid civil-service examination, and retain faithful public servants, and make promotions on merit. But they would have an examination which is practical, which would be conducted by the different departments under which the appointees are to serve, and which would test the men and women practically in the duties they are to discharge; and would have these appointed by the heads of the departments, as directed by the constitution, and not selected by an outside agency of irresponsible officials, absolutely unknown to the constitution, who know nothing of the practical duties required by the different departments, and are not held to any responsibility whatsoever for the proper conduct of such departments. The practical Republican politician would conduct this practical sort of examination, and under a Republican administration he would always appoint a Republican to office. He would do this because, from scriptural teaching and the sum

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of human experience, it is true that a friend always serves you better than an enemy. He does not believe in a life-holding class in office in America. He believes in the honesty of his fellow-men. He believes in friendships, in politics and out, and does not believe that the people's desire for a change in office is simply to give some other man, as a man, a place.

Practical Republicans believe in frequent changes for the public good. When the people at the polls have approved of a party, they believe in changes, not only for the public good, but to carry out the principles indorsed by the people at the polls, and also from a sense of party pride. They did not expect, after the election of President Harrison as a Republican President, to have continued over them in administrative offices, such as post-offices, revenue places, etc., the same Democrats who held the places under President Cleveland. In other words, they believe in Republican officers under a Republican administration, and are ready always to concede Democratic officers under a Democratic administration. If this conclusion is not true, then the Mugwump is right, after all, and all political parties in America ought to disband. In any event the Republican party cannot continue to live half-Mugwump and half-Republican. It must be fair to itself and to its people in 1892, if it cares for its life, and must declare plainly and boldly for one thing or the other—for the full acceptance of the Mugwump theory and a resolute adherence to it when in power, and no pretence of Republican preference, or for an open and fearless Republican theory and preference. I am for the latter. Let it comprehend an actual civil-service reform, but let it be a practical and Republican reform, including a separation of the appointing power from the legislative power. But let it never fall below the standard of party self-respect in America—that for any administrative office, under any party's rule, a man who belongs to that party can be found good enough to fill it.

J. S. CLARKSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

CAN A POOR GIRL GO TO COLLEGE?

CAN a poor girl go to college? It is convenient to limit to a few leading colleges this inquiry as to where and how pecuniary aid is accessible to women students, and it will be sufficient to consider Boston, Cornell, California, Kansas, Michigan, Syracuse, Wesleyan, and Wisconsin universities, Bryn Mawr, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley colleges, and the Harvard "Annex."

In the State universities, California, Kansas, Michigan, and Wisconsin, it is well known that tuition is free, but no form of pecuniary assistance is given undergraduates. The necessary expenses of residence average, for the economical, about $250 a year. Even this sum, in the absence of all scholarships, is sufficient to prevent many students from enjoying the privileges of the universities which the bounty of these States opens to their more well-to-do children. The necessity of living away from home alone renders the university education an unattainable luxury for many who have been able to secure ample preparation at the local high-schools.

Syracuse University is restricted in the aid it may give to the acceptance of the student's note in lieu of the annual charge of $60 for tuition—a form of assistance granted at Cornell also.

In the eight remaining colleges, exclusive of that help which is given privately to the student by individuals, and which cannot be estimated, and the small amounts won by competition for the few prizes for special excellence which have been founded, pecuniary assistance to women flows from three sources—the endowed scholarships, "permanent" and "college-aid" funds, and student-aid societies.

At Boston, Cornell, and Wesleyan universities there are scholarships open alike to both men and women. At Boston there are three such scholarships; their value equals the charge for tuition, their tenure is for one year, and two are now held by women. At Cornell there are 123 State scholarships, covering only the charge for tuition, which are given annually, one in each assembly district, upon a competitive entrance examination, and are tenable four years. During the year 1886–87 twenty-six were held by women. It is impossible to tell exactly how many of them women have held since, but it is officially stated that they certainly hold a percentage probably more than proportionate to their numbers. There are also twenty-four scholarships, of an annual value of $200, and tenable four years. They are awarded by competitive examination, six each year. Three are now held by women. At Wesleyan the forty-eight Seney scholarships are open to both sexes upon equal terms. Their annual value to a student ranges from $50 to $155. They are tenable one year. Eight are held by women. There are also an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indefinite number of scholarships, available at the discretion of the president, which yield free tuition, the equivalent of $75. The Seney scholarships are awarded for work done in the preceding college year. By the Cornell method the entering student may obtain aid which is available at once, while under the Wesleyan system he receives his first scholarship only at the beginning of the sophomore year. The holders of State scholarships at Cornell are eligible to the university scholarships; and the holders of tuition scholarships at Wesleyan to the Seney. During the year 1888-89 six holders of Seney scholarships received tuition also.

SCHOLARSHIPS OPEN TO BOTH MEN AND WOMEN.

College.	Number.	Annual value to student.	Charge for tuition.	Tenure.	Held by women, 1888-89.	Competitive entrance.	Number of women students, 1888-89.
Boston	3	$100	$100	1 year	2	.....	122
Cornell							
University	24	200	75*	4 "	3	6	72
State	512	75	.....	4 "	26†	128	.....
Wesleyan							
Endowed	48	50 to 155	75	1 "	8	.....	13
Tuition	‡	75	.....	1 "	9	.....	.....

* Raised, June, 1889, to $125.
† Year 1886-7.
‡ Indefinite number.

SCHOLARSHIPS OPEN TO WOMEN ONLY.

College.	Number, 1888-89.	Annual value to student.	Charge for tuition.	Competitive entrance.	Years tenable.
Boston	32	$100	$100	.....	.....
Bryn Mawr	12	200	100	3	4
*Cornell	12	200	75	3	4
Smith	2	300	100	.....	.....
.....	2	60	.....	.....	.....
.....	4	50	.....	1	4
.....	75	†	.....	.....	.....
Vassar	7	300 to 400	100	.....	.....
.....	1	400	.....	1	4
Wellesley	26	300	100‡	.....	.....
.....	12	**	.....	.....	.....
.....	5	50	.....	.....	.....

*Sage.
†Free tuition.
‡Henceforth $150.
** Board and tuition, henceforth $350.

Of the scholarships open to women only, thirty-two are at Boston University and yield $100 each. Twelve given by Bryn Mawr yield $200 a year, and were awarded upon a competitive entrance examination. At Cornell the twelve Sage scholarships have yielded $200 annually, and three of these were open each year to the competition of entering students. In October, 1888, the Sage scholarships were abolished. At Smith College two scholarships yield $300 each, and two yield $60; while one of $50 is awarded annually on the result of the entrance examination. In addition, the college gives free tuition "to every student who is unable to complete a collegiate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

education without such aid,"—to an average of seventy-five students each year. At Vassar eight scholarships yield between $300 and $400. One of these was recently offered at Chicago, by the Western Association of Vassar Alumnæ, as a local entrance scholarship. A limited number of local scholarships, covering free tuition, have been offered by the trustees for the next college year. Twenty-six endowed scholarships at Wellesley yield an average of $300; and a provision has been made by which five students receive $50, and another by which twelve others receive the full cost of board and tuition.

At several colleges there are "college-aid" funds, which are collected every year by the officers and friends of the colleges, or voted from the surplus in the college treasury. Boston and Wesleyan universities and Wellesley College are fortunate in the possession of student-aid societies. The sums gathered from these sources vary widely from year to year. In a very few cases the beneficiaries of these funds are also holders of scholarships. The aid given a student ranges from $25 up. At Vassar and Wellesley, in rare cases a maximum of $400 and $300, respectively, is reached. Boston University, through its student-aid society, assisted thirteen girls, giving them a total of $746. Five students of the Harvard Annex received $200 apiece, the equivalent of tuition. Vassar, from its "permanent" funds, helped thirty-seven, with a total of $5,475, and, through the efforts of its president, fifteen, with $2,950. Wellesley gave, *including* the endowed scholarships already enumerated, $14,253 to eighty-two students. Cornell has a small loan fund, which is augmented by special appropriations from year to year. During 1886-87, $225 was loaned to three women. Nothing was lent women during the past year. Wesleyan, also, is able sometimes to lend small sums from a fund held by a student-aid society. The loans are generally to girls in their junior or senior year, and do not exceed $100. They are given with the understanding that the principal shall be returned with simple interest.

The alumnæ of Vassar, together with the very large body of non-graduate former students, are now forming a student-aid society, while the students of the "Annex" are also appealing to past members for support for scholarships.

AID SOCIETIES AND FUNDS.

College.	"Permanent" funds.	"Student-Aid Soc."	"College-Aid" fund.	Number aided, 1888-89.	Amount Given.	Amount returned by students, 1888-89.
Boston	.....	Yes.	.....	13	$746	$115
Bryn Mawr	.....	.....	Yes.	.....	.....	.....
Cornell	.....	.....	Yes.	.....	.....	.....
Harvard Annex	.....	.....	Yes.	5	1,000	.....
Vassar	$100,000	.....	.....	37	5,475	.....
.....	.....	.....	Yes.	15	2,950	.....
Wellesley	.....	Yes.	.....	82*	14,253	1,478
Wesleyan	.....	.....	Yes.	.....	.....	.....

* Including those receiving the income of the endowed scholarships.

Besides aiding through direct gifts or loans of money, the student-aid societies are sometimes able to render good service by bringing to the students knowledge, opportunities, and ways of self-help.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The amount of aid rendered through these various channels may be summed up thus, in its money equivalent: Wellesley, $18,103 to 99 students; Vassar, $11,165 to 65; Smith, $8,420 to about 80; Cornell, an estimated total of $4,950 to 41 individuals; Boston, $4,146 to, perhaps, 47; Bryn Mawr, $2,400 to 12; Wesleyan, $1,575 to 11; and the Harvard "Annex," $1,000 to 5 persons. The total given by these eight colleges was $51,759. A single college for men was able to disburse during the same time not less than $63,000 to its beneficiaries.

Mention might also be made of a voluntary guild at Cornell, the members of which pay a small sum to constitute a fund for the relief of the sick who may need assistance; and of the Eliot Cottage at Wellesley, whose residents save $75 a year of their expenses by a form of coöperative housekeeping. A repetition of the brief list of fellowships completes the tale of the aid accessible to women students. Cornell offers eight fellowships of an annual value of $400; three are held by women. Wesleyan presents one, valued at $150, for which no woman has ever competed. Bryn Mawr offers five, worth $450 each, to graduates of any college, and a European fellowship of $500 a year to a graduate of Bryn Mawr. Vassar offers free tuition, $100, to resident graduates. The Association of Western Alumnæ recently assigned, for one year, a fellowship of $350 to Michigan University. The University of Wisconsin offers nine to both sexes.

FELLOWSHIPS.

College.	Number.	Held by women, 1888-89.	Value.
Bryn Mawr	5	5	$475
.....	1	1	500
Cornell	8	3	400
Michigan	1	1	350
Vassar	*	3	100
Wesleyan	1	.....	150
Wisconsin	9	.....	.....

*Free tuition, number unlimited.

It is worthy of remark that, of the scholarships enumerated as held by women, including the amount given at the "Annex," 160 represent the equivalent of tuition or less. Were the scale of living at these colleges the same as in the towns where State universities exist, it might be said that, so far as concerns the holders of these scholarships, the respective colleges are brought to the basis of the State universities.

Of fifty-seven scholarships which yield more than the cost of tuition, not more than nineteen now equal the whole sum charged for the necessary college expenses, and several of these are not usually awarded in their entirety. These *full* scholarships are the twelve scholarships provided by the Stone Foundation at Wellesley, that given by the Western Association of Vassar Alumnæ, and those which have been endowed at Vassar. The income of seven scholarships at Vassar was awarded to twelve students, in sums ranging from $100 to $400. The permanent funds, known as the "Auxiliary" and "M. Vassar, Jr.," funds, are restricted to a maximum award of $200. The smallest sum given from them was $75. The maximum and minimum awards from the "College-Aid" fund were $400 and $100, but $200 was the average.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The income of the Wellesley scholarships is appropriated yearly under the direction of the Students'-Aid Society. The awards for any college year are made at a meeting held in the preceding May. The income of the twenty-six endowed scholarships ranges from $250 to $345. The average is $300. This income during the past year, together with what was returned by former beneficiaries and what was raised by the society, amounted to $14,253, and was awarded to eighty-two students in sums varying with the needs of the applicants. The largest amount given to one person was $300, the sum there charged for board and tuition. The entire interest of one of these scholarships is rarely given to one student, although "the daughters of missionaries and small-salaried clergymen usually receive the entire amount." This practice accords with the view expressed by Professor Maria Mitchell, who once said: "I have learned to believe that in no case is it best to give the whole expenses as an aid—that it must not be made too easy to be helped along. A struggle is good for the young." Large bequests have been given in harmony with this opinion, restricted to the *partial* payment of the students' expenses. To aid the largest number possible is the almost universal custom of the colleges, and therefore the sum given to each applicant is usually small. The consequence is that the greater number of those who are helped must have *almost* adequate private resources. Moreover, the general policy of the colleges is to help, first, those who have nearly completed their course, those who have been in residence and proved their capacity, and to give aid "at critical times, when without it students would have to give up their college course." The preference is also often given to those in the regular courses and to those who expect to complete the term of residence required for a degree. While such discriminations seem reasonable, they work undoubtedly to the disadvantage of the young applicant from the preparatory school. A few *partial* scholarships have been definitely assigned to candidates for the freshman class. Bryn Mawr, the tables show, offers three annually; Cornell, one in each assembly district of New York, and six for general competition; Smith College, one each year, and Vassar a few local scholarships, besides the Chicago scholarship, covering all charges, which becomes available once in a four years.

Other restrictions limit the eligibility of candidates. Bryn Mawr's twelve scholarships are given only to members of the society of Friends—the only privilege extended them—because the founder, a Friend, wished to help advanced education among his sect. Of the scholarships at Smith, one of the larger gives the preference to the daughters of missionaries or to those preparing for foreign missionary work, while one of the smaller is really a prize open to members of the junior class, proficient students of Shakespeare. Three of the Vassar scholarships are "subject to the nomination of the founder." One gives the preference to members of the Dutch Reformed Church and one to daughters of clerymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Locality is an element which enters into the award of one scholarship at Boston University, which is available for a resident of Washington only, and into the assignment of the income of $25,000 of one of the Vassar funds to the benefit of the children of residents of Poughkeepsie.

In general, there is no understanding that those holding scholarships shall repay what they receive whenever they shall become able so to do, although from the special funds money is both given and loaned. Maria Mitchell's experience is that most girls prefer to borrow, and that "the very carefulness to repay a loan is a check upon unnecessary expenditure. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as some very sensible girls are timid about a loan, I should say, 'Give,' but give just the amount sufficient to bridge over the difficult place. Do not make the journey unnecessarily easy." The choice between gifts and loans involves a question of great delicacy. Either may foster desirable and undesirable qualties in the recipient. A knowledge of the character and circumstances of the beneficiary is an indispensable aid to a wise decision, unless, as at Cornell and Bryn Mawr and Wesleyan, the award be based purely upon scholarship.

Five English colleges for women afford a suggestive contrast. In Girton, Newnham, and Halloway colleges and Lady Margaret and Somerville halls, inquiry disclosed ninety-two scholarships ranging in value from $175 to $420.

SCHOLARSHIPS IN ENGLISH COLLEGES.

College.	Minimum annual charge.	Number of students, 1886-87.	Number of scholarships.	Average annual value.	Maximum annual value.	Tenure in years.
Girton.....	$525	81	27	$260	$420	3
Halloway.....	450	..	27	250	250	3
Lady Margaret.	500	21	3	175	175	3
Newnham.....	375	122	28	250	250	3
Somerville.....	430	27	7	....	....	..

These scholarships, as a rule, are awarded upon the entrance examinations, aggregate merit alone being considered, or together with distinction in some groups of studies, the classics, mathematics, political economy. The winner rests secure in its enjoyment and free from anxiety for three years, the term of residence required for a degree, but she may forfeit it by unsatisfactory work. Some of these scholarships may be augmented in case a student requires further assistance, but only one scholarship may be held by the same student. Provision is also made by Girton and Newnham for loans upon easy terms.

The proportion of scholarships to the whole number of students is considerably larger than in American colleges, the academic year is a fourth shorter, and the expenses of residence nearly as much greater. The advantages which they present over the American method lie in their award to those about to enter, in their fixed tenure and well-defined conditions, and in the certainty of their becoming available to new-comers at a time previously announced. It is interesting to note that they were founded, in many cases, by different guilds—the Cloth workers' Company, the Drapers', and the Goldsmiths'.

A sincere appreciation of the great good which the scholarships existing in American colleges for women confer upon their fortunate recipients is not inconsistent with a recognition of the limitations to their usefulness which the stand-point of the penniless aspirant for a higher education discloses. It is, perhaps, the socialist's point of view.

There comes a time in the course of most secondary schools when every girl must decide whether she shall choose a college preparatory course. Before admission to some Latin schools she must sign a paper stating her intention of entering college. The circumstances of her family are such, let us suppose, that she can hope for no aid from her natural supporters, or, perhaps, none further than a place in the home circle and her most necessary personal expenses. She shows more than average ability in her classes,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Her health is good, and she is eager for a better education. Must a college course, as some affirm, be placed for her in the same category with a carriage and pair or point-lace and diamonds? Is it merely a luxury which her circumstances make it folly to dream of?

She carefully considers all the possibilities. The opportunity for a thorough preparation lies within her grasp, but she realizes that, under the existing conditions of college requirements for admission, it is usually unwise for a student who cannot go to college to choose a preparatory course. The opportunities for self-support at our colleges are known to be very limited. There is an occasional chance for the more advanced students to tutor, a limited amount of clerical and library work to be done, and fortuitous employment of various kinds—all welcome helps, but uncertain supports. The president of Cornell has said very truly that the distinction between skilled and unskilled labor holds true of the employment open to students as in all other classes. It is equally true that the struggling woman student, as well as those with less intellectual ambitions, suffers from the prevalent commercial discrimination against her sex. She is hampered also by more numerous social prejudices than her ambitious brother. Ralph Waldo Emerson might eke out his narrow means by serving as a waiter in the college commons without detriment to his social standing; yet that woman would be brave indeed who would dare imitate his example. If she has to be entirely self-reliant, years must pass, under the present conditions of the employment and recompense of women, before she can save enough to attain her desires.

Meanwhile she is growing rusty in the preliminary studies and less adapted to college routine, while the entrance examination becomes more and more formidable. The partial scholarships may suffice for her friend who in health, character, and mental capacity is not her superior, but whose purse happens to be a little better filled, so that she can afford to incur the greater part or at least a half of the expense of college life, and for a few of those who live in the near neighborhood of a college and who need only the equivalent of tuition, or whose home is a little more distant and who require a small additional allowance for the daily travelling expenses. But the necessity of living at any of these colleges entails, besides travelling and personal expenses, a minimum outlay of from $250 to $300, in addition to the fees for tuition. She who has enough to secure a foothold, and to show of what stuff she is made, may hope to secure the larger grants given to members of the higher college classes, but the breaks in the ranks at the end of the freshman and sophomore years too often disclose how many have been disappointed.

The plans of the penniless girl necessarily rest upon the chance of securing a full scholarship. A glance at the tables reveals the paucity of amply-endowed scholarships. Not long ago, when a single full scholarship was offered for competition among pupils of Chicago preparatory schools, twenty eager girls applied—to the disappointment, of course, of nineteen. Nor is it in Chicago alone that the desire for a college education exists among those of the empty pockets. Their letters are found in every college president's mailbag. In the face of so great competition and so many adverse probabilities, must she not throw prudence and foresight to the winds if she prepare for college, trusting that the *chances* may turn in her favor? One conclusion is inevitable: the existing circumstances give an almost unqualified negative to the question, "Can a poor girl go to college?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2-30

What shall be done? The example of the lady principal of Lady Margaret Hall might be followed. In 1886 she opened, at her own risk, a small house, under the name St. Hugh's, for the reception of students of narrow means, at lower fees, and with a *different scale of living and accommodation*. This would supplement the existing partial scholarships. It is evident, also, that scholarships covering the expense of board and tuition during the first college year are needed, in order to open the path from the preparatory schools. Recently a citizen of New York has generously provided for a few scholarships to be given boys in the city schools who desire to enter the College of the City of New York, and a public-spirited citizen of Fall River, Mass., has given $1,000 to establish prizes for the graduates of the schools of that city. These two cases prove the existence, in men of wealth, of a philanthropic spirit combined with an interest in the local schools, and points out the direction in which the friends of higher education of women should lead. The endowment of full local scholarships, wherever good schools provide free preparation for college, to be awarded annually, under equitable and perfectly understood conditions, with a fixed tenure, would open to many girls, who have every qualification except money, an opportunity to prove their fitness for realizing their reasonable and worthy aspirations.

ALICE HAYES.

TIGHT-LACING FOR MONKEYS.

THE amœba constricts itself around the middle by a pair of invisible corsets until it is actually cut in twain. That the improvement of its *beauty* is a factor in the purpose of this gradual vivibisection is scarcely probable, although in certain stages of the process the form of the fashionable belle is most strikingly suggested. However that may be, the most important result is the reproduction of its kind. Cutting itself in two in the middle is not *hari-kari*, but rejuvenation; not death, but the reduplication of life. Instead of one dead amœba, lo! there are two living ones, equally young and with equal promise of a numerous posterity.

Recent experiments of a somewhat similar nature have been tried upon female monkeys. They were put into plaster-of-paris jackets, in imitation of stays, and a tight bandage was put around the waist to imitate a petticoat band. Several of the unfortunate subjects died, and all showed signs of injuries resulting from the treatment.

Now, the monkey is one of the most highly organized of animals, and to justify so gross and cruel a violation of nature's exquisite handiwork there can be only three hypotheses.

First, it may have been an attempt to reproduce the species by artificial *fission*, after the manner of the amœba. If this was the purpose of the experiment, it was a disastrous failure. Instead of two monkeys, the result was, in several instances, no monkey, and in all the other instances a sadly deteriorated monkey. In this connection it may be remarked that, whenever the experiment has been tried upon another group of *primates*, the *bimana*, the result has been the same. It has not tended to the reproduction of the species—quite the contrary—and in many, many instances it has ended in no primate, or in a sadly deteriorated primate. The attempt to multiply either the simian or the human species by *amœboid fission* must be given up as hopeless.

Secondly, it may have been a well-meant effort to enhance the beauty of our "poor relations" by remodelling their figures in accordance with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rules of modern fashionable art. "Since Darwin and his successors have compelled us to admit their blood relationship with ourselves," the æsthetic experimenters may have thought, "let us at least mitigate the humiliation by making them as presentable as possible." If this was their purpose, the result was, to say the least, disappointing. The "poor relations" did not become ravishingly beautiful, even with the most approved hour-glass-like contour. On the contrary, their physical charms were, if possible, even less alluring than ever. Their countenances lost much of their characteristic vivacity, without gaining perceptibly in refined intellectuality of expression; and their shoulders and arms, never remarkably buxom, became more and more skinny and bony as the experiment progressed.

Similar effects, we are sorry to say, have been often observed in the case of the other group of primates to which allusion has been made.

The third hypothesis is that the experiments were performed as a scientific test of the physiological effects of tight-lacing upon an organism closely allied to our own; and this the experimenters declare to have been their object. One would suppose, however, that the test had already been applied often enough and thoroughly enough upon the human subject herself to determine all that ever can be determined in that direction. The effects are *always* injurious, life-shortening, and sometimes suddenly fatal, although the percentage of mortality is somewhat less than it proved among the unfortunate simians. How men can hope to learn more of human physiology and pathology from monkeys than from the human body itself, dissected and vivisected as it is,—for vivisection may be performed by constriction as well as with the knife, by the aid of *pinchers* as well as *pincers*,—passes the lay comprehension.

But perhaps the investigation was not made in the interest of humanity, after all, but in that of the monkeys themselves. The experimenters may possibly have had an eye to the time when that exceptionally intelligent and *imitative* race shall have developed sufficiently to employ voluntarily human expert aid for their sufferers. If they indulge such a hope, we warn them that it is delusive. Monkeys may be taught to do many things prejudicial to their health. They may be taught to drink, smoke, eat indigestible food, keep late hours, etc.; but when it comes to distorting their figures, crushing and displacing their vitals, for the sake of what is at best an extremely doubtful improvement in gracefulness, we doubt whether so essentially idiotic a fashion will ever prevail to any considerable extent among so intelligent a race as monkeys.

The apology of the experimenters, like those of vivisectionists in general, seems to us inadequate to justify their cruelty. If in the course of their investigations they shall discover some means of enabling the lungs to breathe and the heart to pulsate without expanding, the blood to circulate through tightly-ligatured veins and arteries, and the digestive organs to perform their functions properly while they are huddled and jammed together in the lower abdomen, then, indeed, will their experiments be justified; but merely to demonstrate an obvious truth in a manner less striking than we see it demonstrated every day among our own kind seems only a wanton cruelty and waste of time.

There is only one scientific truth that, so far as we can learn, has been deduced from this curious investigation. It is well known that the lower an animal stands in the scale of differentiation, the more tolerant it is of violence to its structure. The amœba may be not only bisected, but it may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minced into twenty pieces, and each piece will survive and presently become a full-grown amœba; the hydra will endure a similar mutilation with almost equal immunity; the angle-worm may be cut in halves, and the anterior half, at least, will survive. As we ascend in the scale we find less and less tolerance of mutilation, until we reach the highest order, the *primates*. But which of the two great divisions of this order is the higher—the *bimana* or the *quadrumana*? Applying the principle just laid down, and recalling the results of the recent experiments, we are irresistibly forced to a most unwelcome conclusion.

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

THE CLOSING DOOR OF QUACKERY.

ONE of the most interesting volumes ever issued by medical authorities is the recent "Report of the Illinois State Board of Health on Medical Education and Practice." Former reports have been confined to medical education and practice in the United States and Canada. The report for 1891 includes the medical schools, institutions, and laws of all countries. While the comparison is not altogether favorable to the United States, the outlook in this country is more encouraging than ever before, both as regards the adoption of higher standards by the medical colleges and the more intelligent and efficient control of medical practice by the different States.

Since the organization of the first State government on American soil the door of quackery has stood open, and the ignorant and poor have been at the mercy of designing and unscrupulous men calling themselves doctors. The first laws passed in this country were too rigid, as a rule, and could not be enforced, and scarcely anything was done to protect the health, lives, and property of the people against these people until fifteen years ago. Forty-one States and territories now have laws in regard to the regulation of the practice of medicine, forty of these laws having been passed since January 1, 1875. Some of these laws are now inoperative, and, if operative, would be inefficient. The States that have no laws for regulating the practice of medicine are Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island; Utah has no law, and the Creek Nation, in the Indian Territory, has no law. The existing laws are entirely or practically inoperative in Arkansas, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Ohio, and Texas.

In many of the States and territories the law requires a person wishing to practise medicine to register his diploma in a county clerk's office. Such a law is obviously inefficient, because a fraudulent diploma can be registered under it. So with regard to laws requiring that the diploma recorded shall be that of a "legally-chartered" medical college. Some of the worst and most fraudulent colleges that have existed in this country were "legally chartered." Twenty-three States and territories now have efficient laws, under which the State Board of Health or the State Board or Boards of Medical Examiners (1) give certificates on diplomas of medical colleges "in good standing," or examine applicants that have not such diplomas; or (2) examine all applicants for the license, irrespective of diplomas. Of these laws eight were passed in 1889 and 1890.

The total number of medical colleges embraced in the new report of the Illinois board is 316, of which there are or have been in the United States 294 and in Canada twenty-two. Of the 316, the total of the extinct schools is 168, of which 159 were in the United States and nine in Canada. There are now 135 medical schools in the United States and thirteen in Canada. Of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

159 extinct schools of the United States twenty-three were fraudulent. There are now in existence twelve colleges or institutions known to be fraudulent—simply diploma-mills. One each of these is in New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Washington, two in New York, three in Vermont, and four in Ohio; and there is another in Ohio that may as well be classed as fraudulent.

But they that believe in higher medical education and in protecting the people against swindlers claiming to be doctors, as well as against half-educated men with diplomas, have much cause for rejoicing. In the past ten years the duration of the annual lecture terms has been extended from 23.5 weeks to 26.3 weeks, and the number of schools having sessions of six months or more has increased from forty-two to 111. In the same time the percentage of graduates to matriculates has fallen in the United States from 32.7 to 30.1. In Canada this percentage is 23+ for 1890, the highest for ten years. With the session of 1882-83 the Illinois schedule of minimum requirements for the colleges went into effect, and the number of matriculates in this country was immediately diminished. In 1881-82 the number was 12,452; it went steadily down to 10,987 in 1884-85, when it began to rise again, and in 1889-90 it was 14,884.

It is a noticeable fact that the loss of students when the Illinois schedule went into effect was, as a rule, felt most severely by the schools having low standards of entrance and graduation. Before the session of 1883-84 there were but forty-five medical colleges in this country that exacted educational qualifications as a requirement for matriculation; now there are 129. Before 1883-84 twenty-two colleges required attendance on three or more courses of lectures; the number is now eighty-five.

In the near future the figures will be still better. So many colleges have made provision for three courses of lectures, four years' study and three courses of lectures, or four courses of lectures, that there are now but twenty-one colleges that require only two courses and have made no provision for longer study. It may be predicted that in five years every college in this country will have adopted the requirement of four years' study and three courses of lectures. What has been done is the result, mainly, of the work of the various examining boards, which now control the recognition of diplomas in an area containing about 41,000,000 people. A further impetus has been given by the rules adopted by the American Medical College Association, the National Eclectic Medical Association, and the National Institute of Homœopathy in regard to the time and subjects of medical education and in regard to preliminary education. The Chicago Medical College was the first medical institution in the United States to adopt the three-years' graded course for the study of medicine; this action was taken on June 4, 1868.

In regard to the preliminary education of medical men it must be said that the time-honored classical course is insufficient, and that much time is lost in the study of subjects that can be of no benefit to the medical man. The University of Pennsylvania, the University of Wisconsin, and Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Lake Forest, Northwestern, Princeton, and Yale universities now offer academic courses specially designed for students that propose to study medicine. The physician must study nature always; he must be a naturalist; for this work he should be prepared by scientific training. An attempt was recently made to establish a course preparatory to medicine in the University of Michigan, but the effort was unsuccessful. This was unfortunate, and the more so because by it the student could obtain the B. Sc. instead of the A. B. degree, which now amounts to but little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this country. The plan was one by which the student could take the B. Sc. and M. D. degrees in six years, the former including studies that lead directly up to the study of medicine, besides French, German, English, mathematics, logic, rhetoric, and mental philosophy. Every medical man should have a special preliminary education.

The chief defects in the American system of medical education are: 1. Too little preliminary education, from which comes a lack of ability to grasp scientific principles. 2. Too much didactic work by the teachers. 3. Too little practical and clinical work by the students. 4. Too few tests of practical work. 5. Too short a time of actual work and study. Increasing the preliminary requirements and lengthening the time of study will remedy the other defects; and the application of the remedy will kill off the useless and low-class colleges. In Minnesota, Montana, and Washington every candidate for examination and license must have attended three courses of lectures. The same will be required by the California boards after April 1, 1891, by the Colorado board after July 1, 1893, in Illinois and Iowa after the session of 1890-91, and by the boards of examiners of New York after September 1, 1891.

The Illinois report, embracing the institutions and regulations of all countries, shows that, while there is a general movement in this country for four years' study and three courses of lectures, the General Medical Council of Great Britain and Ireland has decreed that every medical student beginning his medical studies after January 1, 1892, must be engaged in the study of medicine for five years. The first year may be passed at a teaching institution, recognized by the licensing bodies of the United Kingdom, where physics, chemistry, and biology are taught. Graduates in arts or science of any university recognized by the Medical Council, who shall have spent a year in the study of physics, chemistry, and biology, and have passed an examination in these subjects for the degrees in question, should be held to have completed the first of the five years of medical study. The General Medical Council will require that the fifth year be devoted to clinical work in one or more hospitals or dispensaries. The candidate for any medical degree in the United Kingdom must pass five examinations before he can receive the degree. In this way the final examination is almost wholly given up to clinical examinations on patients in the hospitals. These examinations are foreign to the schools and licensing bodies in the United States, and it will be a long step in advance when they are the rule in this country.

Both in Europe and in the South American republics medical education and the right to practise are on a higher plane than in this country. But we are now going forward at a good pace, and it is not too much to predict that during the present decade each State will have an efficient medical-practice act, and the rule in the colleges will be a high standard of preliminary and matriculation requirements, and *five years' study* and four courses of lectures. The door of quackery is being closed, not by the voluntary action of the colleges, but by wise legislation in the interests of the people.

WILLIAM G. EGGLESTON, M. D.

A NATIONAL CHORUS.

AS THE time rapidly approaches when the civilized nations of the earth are expected to assist our country in its great Columbian World's Fair, evidence begins to accumulate showing that our people are expecting something of an extraordinary character in the art of music, as well as in the fine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arts. It seems to lovers of music, as well as to musicians themselves, that it would be almost a crime unpardonable if they should fail to seize this opportunity to accomplish something for the advancement of their art, and bequeath to posterity lasting results.

Such an occasion comes not once in a lifetime; not even once in a century; and it is safe to say that never in history has a similar event been celebrated which so completely enlisted the patriotic impulses of any nation.

That the formation of a national choral union for this celebration would awaken enthusiasm throughout the length and breadth of our land, that it would in each State create a new impulse for the art, and, by its successful performance in Chicago inaugurate a new era, with magnificent promises of future results, will be freely admitted.

To assist in the attainment of this great purpose the following plan is suggested with reference:

First, to *artistic success;* sustaining our dignity as a nation;

Second, to *permanent results*, for the advancement of the art of music in America;

Third, to the *financial success* of the exposition.

In pursuance of the foregoing, I suggest the formation of a national choral union, composed of some of the best voices in every State, thus bringing together a representative body of our entire people. This chorus should number not more than 10,000 nor less than 5,000 voices, and should participate in the opening ceremonies in a world's festival of song, lasting five days or a week.

The following programme is suggested as adapted to the occasion:

First night—Sacred music. Oratorio. Selections from Händel, Haydn, Bach, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Schumann.

Second night—Secular music. Opera. Selections from Verdi, Gounod, Von Weber, Gluck, Meyerbeer, Wagner.

Third night—Part-songs of all nations.

Fourth night and fifth night—Original works by American composers.

Matinée—Patriotic music and singing by school children.

As will be observed, the programme is simple, and will need to be dignified by a large body of singers. The plan does not embrace the engagement of celebrated solo singers, as that would double the expense, without adding anything to the advancement of art, and the intention is to make the ponderous effect of the chorus the main attraction. It would appear undignified, unpatriotic, and beyond the province of a world's fair to enter the arena of amusements, and appeal for patronage in art to that element of curiosity attaching merely to great names.

The question naturally arises, How can this be done? How is a large mass of singers to be organized and drilled, music secured, etc., etc.? Without going into details, I will briefly suggest the following as a feasible plan: Let each State send a number of singers, proportionate to its population; the number to be determined according to the size of the mass-chorus desired. Each State should have its separate choral organization complete—officers, musical director, etc., the Governor of the State being the honorary president. Each State choral union taking part would be expected to pay its own expenses, special cheap railway fares being provided.

Each State should also furnish and pay for its music, for which the Legislature should make an appropriation, which would amount in each case to only a few hundred dollars at most.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Each State organization should be encouraged to give one or two public performances during the year, which would serve the triple purpose of raising a fund to pay the expenses of any good singers who might not be able otherwise to participate; of showing their advancement in singing; and of awakening an interest in the great world's festival of song.

All these State organizations should be subject to certain rules and obligations, and a national director and organizer should rehearse every organization twice or three times in all the music, so as to preserve a unity in style, phrasing, etc.

Without further details, the great importance of securing State-legislative recognition of music (which, it is safe to say, with the coöperation of the national commissioners, probably not a single State would refuse) will at once be apparent. This interest, once secured, could easily be perpetuated, to the permanent advantage of the art.

The national chorus once formed, great festivals of the same character could be arranged for triennially or decennially; and thus incalculable good may be secured through the present opportunity with comparatively little trouble—almost "without money and without price."

To every earnest musician and music-lover the plan pleads its own cause. It remains to be seen if, with the assistance of the World's Fair commissioners and directory, we shall have the opportunity to create an epoch in music that will shed the lustre of its glory throughout succeeding generations.

S. G. PRATT.

S. G. PRATT, *Esq.*

DEAR SIR: I fully indorse the above plan, and think it might be productive of great good to the cause of music in our country.

That a large proportion of the scheme is practical I feel certain; and that excellent results and impressive performances could be obtained with such a mass-chorus properly drilled I am convinced, *provided suitable music is selected.*

The appropriateness of inaugurating this work for the Columbian celebration is undoubted, if for no other reason than the general interest which it would awaken in polyphonic music over the whole country; and I hope that the endeavor will be made.

Yours truly,

THEODORE THOMAS.

A CATHOLIC ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

THE ordinary non-Catholic, when he considers the relation of the Catholic Church to the problem of general education, finds himself face to face with an imaginary solid phalanx marching forward to sweep the American public-school system off the face of the land. As he has been taught that the American school system—by which he means, of course, the system of common education in vogue in parts of the United States—is a glorious thing, and in some way responsible for the prosperity of this country, he resents this imaginary attempt to reduce the people to that condition of barbarism which existed before children were fed in equal doses from the big public-school spoon. In searching literature for an illustration of this process of education, one finds it in dear Mrs. Squeers's impartial distribution of sulphur and molasses to her husband's pupils at Dotheboys' Hall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even the extraordinary non-Catholic, while having doubts about the splendor of our school system, has greater doubts about the intentions of the church. He has a vague belief that Catholics, who may be individually very reasonable and almost indistinguishable from other Americans, will at a moment's notice form into close ranks behind mitres and crosiers, and capture the public schools or destroy them for the greater political glory of the church.

Usually it does not enter our friend's mind to imagine that the American citizen preferring the Catholic faith has any vital, personal, human interest in the educational question. If the public schools are good enough for the Methodist, the Congregationalist, the Agnostic, why does the Catholic object to them otherwise than because Rome, for purposes of political aggrandizement, insists that he shall keep his children out of them, if possible? This is his question.

It must be confessed that lay members of the church take little trouble to answer it. They have got into the habit of forcing the burden of representing them on the shoulders of their bishops and priests. It is a very bad habit, and one that has created dry-rot in the social life of older countries. It leads to a condition of indolent cynicism which destroys alike true religion and true patriotism. There are times when laymen must speak for themselves out of the fulness of faithful and pure hearts. They are the fathers of children; on them rests the responsibility of making the family a firmer factor for the good of the race. The bishops and priests teach and direct and at times lead; they are the spiritual fathers of the people; but the heaviest responsibility is on the natural fathers who cannot shift it from themselves. The Catholic religion recognizes this so deeply that her priests will not adminster the regenerating sacrament of baptism to a child without parental consent; thus the parent is admitted to have greater power over his child than that of life and death. Parental rights are paramount.

Another reason why we Catholic laymen seem to have so little to say on subjects of a religious complexion is that our creed fits us so closely that it is part of ourselves. It is not a hair shirt, but a very easy vestment. Nothing is gained, except discomfort, by trying to force it on others whom it might not fit and who might get tired of it. And, believing as we do that religion is, first of all, a matter of correspondence between God's grace and man's will, we have perhaps a well-founded distrust of our efforts towards the conversion of people whose invincible ignorance in matters spiritual may be a stronger plea for them at the throne of mercy than that enlightenment by which many of us profit so little. Speaking for myself, I know non-Catholics whom I never meet without intense admiration for their elevation of thought and action, or without intense self-abasement and regret that I, walking in all the splendor of the spouse of Jesus Christ, am so much less worthy of the gift of faith. I wish earnestly that to the lustre of their virtues were added the consolations and safeguards which the church gives to her children. I hope that they are Catholics of the invisible church and one with the visible church in the communion of saints.

Knowing, as most Catholics do, many Protestants of the highest character, the Catholic is neither aggressive nor apologetic. He is easy and comfortable in his relations with men who respect his belief; he leaves the expression of religious truth to his spiritual instructors; he believes in the omnipotent power of prayer, although his fear of seeming to imitate the prevalent religious cant may induce him to say nothing about it. But,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nevertheless, he holds that the most precious possession his children can have is that of faith in Christianity; and Christianity in all its fulness, in all the perfection of its divine evolution through the centuries since the coming of our Lord, is held and taught only by the church.

Now, much as he may admire his Protestant friends, of naturally good dispositions, environed by circumstances which strengthen their natural goodness, he asks: How can their children, surrounded by the atmosphere of a time and a language permeated with the influence of neo-paganism, retain Christian morality without deep faith in Christian dogmas as safeguards for the practice of that morality? Public-school education does not supply these; the Sunday-schools are in the long run useless, and the old-fashioned orthodox Protestant family training has irretrievably gone out of fashion. It was a good thing while it lasted; but it had no qualities of permanency. It admitted the right of private judgment in religion,—of private interpretation of the Scriptures,—and "all went loose," as the Germans say. Besides, its Calvinism brought about reaction.

Rationalism in Germany and agnosticism in England are logical conclusions from the free thought in matters of religion enjoined by Protestantism; infidelity in France and Italy is a revolt against the church which commands "Credo" to be the final answer to all doubts concerning the divine origin of Christianity or the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. The irresistible tendency of Protestantism is to revert to its original element; to the element of human protest against dogmatic restrictions and supernatural claims. The tendency of the time is to explain the supernatural by the preternatural. It is easy to believe that science can work a miracle, but very hard to believe that God can work it directly, unaided by science.

In view of this tendency, which permeates literature, which pushes itself forward in the lecture-hall, and even into the pulpit, which colors the matter and manner of the newspaper writer and reporter, which is the energy of the time and the breath of its nostrils, where can a father turn if he believes that the infallible Christian faith taught by the infallible church is the only salvation and safeguard for his children? Where is he to turn for that strengthening of character, spiritual and moral, which he feels his children must have in order to save themselves and to be conservative Christian forces in society? He cannot depend on family teaching only, for fathers are busy and mothers careworn. Such teaching, at best, would be intermittent. He knows that an hour a week in the Sunday-school devoted to the preservation of the religion which Christ died to promulgate, which is the only refuge from anarchy and despair and destruction, is like a mere scratch on the surface of that *tabula rasa*, the child's heart. He knows that a school, public or private, in which the only ackowledgement of the great force that raised earth to heaven and brought heaven to earth is the recitation of the Lord's prayer and the perfunctory reading of a translation of a book that, humanly speaking, is contradictory and incomprehensible, cannot fill his child with a sense of the preciousness of Christianity, of admiration for its awful mysteries, of reverence for its rites, or arm him with that safeguard of safeguards, the habit of frequenting the confessional. A Catholic would rather see his only son die in the flower of youth than know certainly that that son would never use the means provided by the church for the cleansing of his soul from the sins which kill its life.

This has been said to show that Catholic laymen have the most profound interest in the question of education. They do not submit to a double tax for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school purposes merely out of "pure cussedness," nor out of "blind obedience" to the voice of Rome. The voice of Rome is the voice of God and their own consciences; but, if Rome had not spoken, no thoughtful Catholic could conscientiously accept entirely secular education for his children: therefore the present public-school system does not satisfy him. He strains every nerve to send his children to Catholic schools. When this is impossibe, he does the best he can.

Primarily, he cares nothing for the aggrandizement of what is called the political power of the church. He knows there are men—professional politicians—only too willing to avail themselves of the prestige that may be acquired by seeming to be the familiars of prelates of the church,—men who use this association, as women anxious to get into "society" use their "church connections" and charitable plans, for purposes of their own. And he knows, too, that, while a prelate or a priest may accept in his charitable efforts the help of such men, the priest or prelate is obliged to take the risk of seeming to have political affiliations, because it is impossible to snub a politician who is *so* kind to the orphans and *so* anxious for the glory of God's house. One may distrust the Greeks when they bear gifts, but it is sometimes impossible to kick them out, for the gifts might go with them. And gifts when there are churches to be supported, and hospitals to be founded, and schools to be built, and asylums to be freed from debt, and orphans to be brought up in the belief and practice of Christianity, are not to be neglected, unless they are plainly the wages of sin.

Nevertheless, none of us desires great material possessions for the church or the religious orders of the church; nor that the church and state in this country shall be united; neither do we want a prelate of the church whose kingdom is not of this earth to be a political ruler in the land. In fact, we do not think of these things at all. We are prouder of Newman and Manning and Gibbons and Lavigerie than of Richelieu or Wolsey. We have read history with some advantage, and we know that the old world has less to teach than our new world has to learn, but that here, of all countries, the Christian Church is most untrammelled, most free, most respected, because she is least involved in the changing and treacherous sands of politics. We do desire religious and practical education for our children; and it is impossible to get either in the public schools which are the creation of mediocrity for the perpetuation of mediocrities. We must have religious schools, for our children *must* be Catholics in order to be Christians; and therefore, with limited means and at the cost of sacrifices, we are assisting our bishops and priests to form Catholic schools, which, in time, may lose their worst fault—their similarity to the public schools so far as the practical part of education is concerned.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED